THE SECOND PART OF A DISCOURSE

Concerning

Imputed Righteouſneſs.

Together with a large Preface in Anſwer to Mr *Throughtons* late Book intituled *Lutherus Redivivus:*

And a Poſtſcript containing a Vindication of the Authors Doctrine in the former part, againſt the Reflections of Dr *John Owen* in his late Book of Juſtification.

By *Thomas Hotchkis* Rector of *Stanton* by *Highworth* in the County of *Wilts:*

LONDON,

Printed for *Walter Kettleby* at the *Biſhops-head* at the Weſt-end of St. *Pauls* Church-yard, 1678.

THE SECOND PART OF A DISCOURSE

Concerning

Imputed Righteousness.

Together with a large Preface in Answer to Mr *Throughton's* Book intituled *Luther's Doctrine*:

And a Postscript containing a Vindication of the Authors Doctrine in the former part, against the Reflections of Dr *John Owen* in his late Book of Justification.

By *Thomas Hotchkis* Rector of *Stanton* by *Highworth* in the County of *Wilts*.

LONDON,

Printed for *Walter Kettleby* at the *Bishops-head* at the West-end of St. *Pauls* Church-yard, 1678.

BIBLIOTHECA BODLEIANA

THE PREFACE.

Containing Reflections more at large upon Mr *Throughtons* late Book, ſtyled *Lutherus Redivivus.*

Chriſtian Reader,

Forasmuch as the Title-page, together with the Index annexed to this Second part of my Diſcourſe (Written indeed and ſent to the Stationer two years ago in order to its being made publick) do plainly and fully declare the ſcope and ſubject matter thereof, I ſhould not have deemed it neceſſary in the leaſt to have prefixed any Preface thereunto, were it not to give thee to underſtand, that a few weeks ago there came to my hands Mr Throughtons *late Book Entituled* (Lutherus Redivivus, *or*, The Proteſtant

Doctrine of Justification by Faith onely.) *Which having read throughout and finding my self (together with those two very Learned Writers, Mr* Richard Baxter, *and Mr* Joseph Truman) *by name therein opposed, I have thought it expedient for the vindication and confirmation of that Doctrine, which is held forth in both parts of this Discourse, to speak somewhat more at large in reference thereunto.*

In this undertaking I intend these four things.

1. *A brief relation of the scope of the said Authors Book.*

2. *A manifestation of his want of candour and conscience in his frequent misrepresenting the doctrine of his brethren, disguising their true sense and meaning, and mistaking the Question, or Questions in debate betwixt him and them.*

3. *A punctual answer to every passage in his book, wherein I find my self by name concerned.*

4. *Forasmuch as by his book he pretends to be a great friend to the Protestant cause against Arminianism, Socinianism, and Popery, I will give in a list of several his doctrines, with some animadversions upon them therein divulged, and thereupon leave it to the judgement of the learned and impartial Reader, whether instead of real service*

he

he hath not done great diſſervice to the Proteſtant Cauſe and Churches.

1. *As to the firſt, The ſcope of his book is apparently to maintain a ſinners juſtification to be onely by faith,* i. e. *by faith taken in a ſtrict ſenſe by way of contradiſtinction from all other graces or duties of evangelical obedience (ſuch as repentance for ſin, or ſincere purpoſe for amendment of life) Yea that it is onely by that kind of act of faith, which he doth all along ſtyle, A truſting in the promiſe of Chriſt, of ſalvation by Chriſt, of free grace in Chriſt or of God through Chriſt for mercy. Nor will he acknowledg, that this truſting in the promiſe is commanded ſinners in the goſpel as any proper condition of their juſtification, but only as a natural means and way to it, denying alſo perſeverance in faith and holineſs to be required of God as the condition, upon which a ſinner is to continue, or be continued in a pardoned and juſtified eſtate.* Faith (*ſays he p.* 122.) is commanded as the natural and onely means of ſaving a ſinner, who hath no righteouſneſs of his own. And (*p.* 23.) Faith is not a proper condition, but a natural qualification capacitating the ſoul to receive benefit by Chriſt, appointed by God for that uſe and having the promiſe of ſucceſs.....

This is that pretended Proteſtant doctrine of juſtification by faith onely, which he ſets himſelf his book throughout to vindicate, as againſt multitudes of his Brethren of a different judgment therein from himſelf, ſo more eſpecially againſt that Anteſignanus in this warfare Mr Richard Baxter: *for having ſaid in his Epiſtle to the Reader (p. 2, 3.) that the contrary opinion to his hath of late diffuſed it ſelf amongſt men of all Perſwaſions, Forms and Modes amongſt us, ſo he ſays particularly concerning Mr* Richard Baxter, *p. 6. That he hath diffuſed this doctrine, viz. That faith and ſincere obedience to the goſpel are therein required of ſinners as the condition of their ſalvation by Chriſt, through all his writings, of which doctrine he paſſeth this peremptory cenſure, or ſentence, ſaying in his Epiſtle, p. 3.* It is no other, than the old Popiſh doctrine diveſted of the School-Terms.

2. *As to the ſecond thing promiſed (the manifeſtation of his want of candour in miſreporting the doctrine of his adverſaries, his miſtating of the Queſtion, or Queſtions in debate, &c.) in order thereunto among very many I ſhall onely ſingle out a few the following inſtances, beginning with that in his Epiſtle, where p. 3.* In ſhort, *ſays he,* this is the Queſtion, Whether we be accepted, and entitled to life for the righteouſneſs,

which

which Christ wrought for us, or for our own righteousness, or obedience to the Gospel whether Christ wrought any righteousness to justifie and save us by, or only died to procure this grant, that we should be justified and saved by believing and obeying the Gospel.

Answ. *The Question, or Questions betwixt him and his Brethren are here most falsly reported by him: for none of them (of what perswasion, form, or mode whatsoever) did ever question, whether we be accepted and entitled to life for the righteousness, which Christ wrought for us, or whether Christ wrought any righteousness to justifie and save us by: for to make a Question of this, is to question the word of God in the very letter of it, which says, That we are justified by the blood of Christ, and that by His Obedience We are made Righteous,* Rom. 5. 9, 18. *Let the Reader therefore take notice of the words of this Author in the same page and immediately following, as an intolerable slander, he there saying.* It is the latter opinion, that is, We are entitled to life for our own righteousness, not for the righteousness, which Christ wrought for us, which many now publish in Pulpit and Press. *We publish no such doctrine in press, or pulpit.*

2. *In ſhort, the Queſtions are ſuch as theſe.*

1. *Whether ſinners be accepted and entitled to life, juſtified, or pardoned actually and immediately for the ſake of that righteouſneſs, which Chriſt wrought for them, or whether their actual pardon, or diſcharge for Gods ſake doth not depend upon their performance of certain duties required in the goſpel in order thereunto, the faithfull performance of which duties being commonly ſtyled our perſonal, or evangelical righteouſneſs, and in the language of Scripture,* The righteouſneſs of Saints, Rev. 19. 8.

2. Q. *Whether according to the goſpel-law, or ordination of God a ſinners actual juſtification, or pardon doth depend onely upon faith ſtrictly taken in way of oppoſition to other evangelical graces, or (as ſome would have it) upon one elicite act of faith ſtyled (truſting, recumbing, relying upon Chriſt, or the promiſe in Chriſt---) or elſe Whether it doth not depend upon other graces alſo, or upon certain other imperated acts of faith, i. e. upon faith its acting it ſelf in, or by repentance for ſin, holy deſires, ſincere purpoſes for amendment of life and the like?*

3. Q. *Whether, as a ſinners entring into a pardoned and juſtified eſtate doth depend upon the ſaid acts, or actings of faith by a penitential return to God in Chriſt, ſo, Whether*

ther a ſinners continuance in that ſaving eſtate, his full pardon in all its effects, or final juſtification and ſalvation doth not alſo depend upon his perſeverance in faith and holineſs, as the condition thereof, or the thing preſcribed by God in order thereunto?

4. Q. *Whether that very righteouſneſs, which Chriſt wrought to juſtifie and ſave us by, be in its eſſential nature imputed to us, and We juſtified and ſaved by the imputation thereof in that ſenſe, or elſe Whether it be imputed to us in ſuch a ſenſe as our ſins were to him,* i. e. *in its ſaving fruits and effects? the imputation whereof in which latter ſenſe I take to be the true Proteſtant Doctrine, and I am glad to perceive, that it is ſo acknowledged to be by this Author, pag.* 10. 11. *where he reports their Doctrine in the expreſs words tranſcribed, as followeth.*

The righteouſneſs of Chriſt, whereby he fulfilled the law, is imputed to belivers for their juſtification, *i. e.* for that his righteouſneſs God grants them pardon of ſin and a firm gift, or grant of eternal life.

Lo the true Proteſtant Doctrine concerning the imputation of Chriſts righteouſneſs to believers, the imputation whereof in that ſenſe being the Doctrine pleaded for by my ſelf and the brethren in conſort with me; ſo falſly is it ſaid of us by this Author in the ſame pages, That we do (upon a pretenſe

there feigned by him) deny, that Chriſts righteouſneſs cannot in that ſenſe be imputed to us.

Page 13. *He repreſents the Doctrine of his Brethren concerning juſtification in the following words here tranſcribed.*

Juſtification is nothing elſe but the pardon of ſin, *i. e.* the not exacting the puniſhment of ſin due by the law of works, and an acceptance of man ſo far and ſo long as he performeth the new condition of ſincere obedience. *And he ſays*, p. 99. That according to us Chriſt died onely for ſins againſt the law.

Whereas we ſay, That Goſpel-juſtification doth comprize the pardon of all ſin againſt any law whatſoever (whether againſt the law of works or of grace) onely final impenitency, or unbelief excepted, all former, or temporary unbelief, and impenitency being pardoned to a juſtified perſon, when juſtified and all the bewailed imperfections of his new obedience being pardoned alſo, it continuing to be ſincere, ſo that the thing we ſay is, That Chriſt died for the pardon of ſin both againſt the Law, and Goſpel.

In p. 14. *As to the Queſtion, By what way, or means Chriſts righteouſneſs and the benefits of it are made ours, he thus ſtates the matter*, viz.

Whe-

Whether by truſting in it according to Gods promiſe as the immediate and ſole cauſe of pardon and right to life (as all, *ſays he*, till of late have taught) or whether all the benefit of it be, that it hath procured a new covenant, *viz.* That they, who believe and obey the Goſpel, ſhall be ſaved, though their obedience be not perfect?

Anſw. *The matter is not as thus reported by this Author, but the Queſtion is, whether God hath promiſed, that Chriſts righteouſneſs in the benefits thereof ſhall be ours and we ſaved thereby meerly by the means of our truſting thereunto, or whether beſides that acting of faith by the way of truſt or reliance, God doth not alſo require the acting of faith in the way of obedience to other commands of the Goſpel as a means, whereby, or as a condition whereupon ſinners are to be ſaved, and upon which obedience (though imperfect, yet if ſincere) ſinners ſhall certainly be ſaved for the ſake of Chriſts righteouſneſs as the ſole meritorious cauſe thereof; but otherwiſe and without ſuch Goſpel-obedience not at all? So that it is untruly ſaid by him, that the ſaid Queſtion as by him ſtated was agitated amongſt us about 30 years ſince in oppoſition to growing Antinomianiſme: nor was there any juſt ground for him to ſay as he immediately doth in the following words.* And

And becauſe it ſeemed moſt effectually to overthrow that Error (of Antinomianiſm) and to be an ingenuous notion, *viz.* That we ſhould be ſaved by our works, and yet works are not to be meritorious, but ſubordinate to Chriſt, it began to pleaſe many, who (I believe) little thought, they ſhould come utterly to exclude the righteouſneſs of Chriſt from any part of juſtification, and make it only ſubſervient to mans works; they, that followed the controverſie, found, that they could not defend our being juſtified by our works, unleſs they denied our being juſtified by Chriſts righteouſneſs; for that alone if imputed, is ſufficient to juſtifie.

Anſw. 1. *Although we do upon good ground exclude Chriſts righteouſneſs from being any part of juſtification (foraſmuch as Chriſts righteouſneſs is a thing wholly extrinſecal to juſtification even as a cauſe is to its effect;) nevertheleſs we do not in the leaſt exclude it from doing its proper part towards the effecting of a ſinners juſtification,* viz. *the part of a meritorous cauſe.*

2 *We are no way neceſſitated to deny our being juſtified by Chriſts righteouſneſs as the meritorious cauſe of that ſaving benefit (much leſs did we ever deny our being juſtified thereby) becauſe we do aſſert, that God doth in the promiſes of the Goſpel require certain*

good

good works in order to our partaking in the benefits of it, viz. justification, remission of sin, or eternal salvation; of the actual participation of which saving benefits although our faithfull works, or working faith may be truly said to be the means whereby, or the condition whereupon we are pardoned, justified, or saved, Yet Christs righteousness truly is the sole meritorious cause; so that it is falsly said by this Author, that we cannot defend our being justified by means of our faithfull works, unless we deny our being justified by the righteousness of Christ.

3. As it is a contradiction to say of us (as this Author here doth) that we do utterly exclude the righteousness of Christ from any part of justification (his meaning is, from doing any part towards it) and make it only subservient to mans work (for if we make it subservient to mans works, we cannot truly be said, even for that very reason utterly to exclude it from any part;) so it is falsly said, that we do make Christs righteousness subservient to mans works; though withall it is most true to say, That Christs righteousness and mans faithfull works do after a different manner, or in a way peculiar to each, serve for, or towards one and the same end and purpose, viz. The salvation of sinners; the one as the alone meritorious cause, the other as the means under Christ whereby,

or

or the condition upon which a ſinner is to be ſaved, even as it is true to ſay alſo, That it is Chriſt, who ſaves the ſinner, and it is the ſinner alſo, who under Chriſt muſt ſave himſelf.

4. *It is a notion not only ingenuous (as this Author phraſeth it) but alſo Scriptural to ſay, That we may be ſaved by our works: and yet works not be meritorious, but ſubordinate to Chriſt; for the Scripture ſays, that the Saints of old did διὰ, by, or through faith and not by faith onely, but by works alſo, even through faith and patience inherit the promiſes,* Heb. 6. 12. *whom we are there exhorted to follow, ſeeking the ſame heritage by patient continuance in well doing, as is the Apoſtles expreſſion,* Rom. 2. 7.

Having ſaid, p. 36. *That God will freely forgive a ſinner upon his flying for refuge to the blood of Chriſt, he chargeth us with the following words,* No *ſay our Authors*, pardon is not granted for what Chriſt hath done, nor a right to heaven, but it is offered and promiſed upon condition of mans future and ſincere obedience.

Anſw. *We do not ſay, that pardon is not granted upon what Chriſt hath done, but this we ſay, That pardon is not conferred upon ſinners, or ſinners are not actually and immediately pardoned upon what Chriſt hath done, the actual enjoyment of pardon being offered*

and

and promiſed to them upon condition, which condition is not meerly a ſinners flying for refuge to the blood of Chriſt (which a ſinner may do in ſuch ſort as Joab *did to the horns of the altar, yet found it not a place of refuge for ſuch a Malefactor as himſelf, and in which ſort thoſe workers of iniquity* Mat. 7. 21, 22, 23. *ſeem to fly for refuge to Jeſus Chriſt) but a return to God by repentance altogether with a ſincere purpoſe of future amendment of life. And it is no ſmall wrong, that this Author hath done his Brethren, in miſrepreſenting their Doctrine by the following ſimilitude, p.* 26.

Even as a Captive (it is their own ſimilitude, *ſays he*) is ſet at liberty, that he may try his friends and uſe means to procure the price appointed and agreed for his ranſome, which when he hath fully procured and paid in, then by the contract he muſt be ſet at liberty, and if he procure not the price, then he muſt return to his bondage with this aggravation of his miſery, that there was liberty, or redemption to be had, but he fell ſhort of it. All this while the man is a priſoner, though at large, and is as it were upon parol, his redemption dependeth upon certain conditions to be fulfilled by him.

Anſw. *Till this Author, or ſome other for him ſhall nominate any of their Brethren, who*

who did ever use this similitude in the case before us, I shall take liberty to think this similitude to be of this Author's pure invention and not theirs; for his Brethren do not say as is aforesaid of them, but this they say and affirm constantly, That the price of a sinners redemption is already paid by Christ and accepted by God the Father; so that the price is not at all by them to be procured, nor is any such duty as the procuring the price of their redemption (whether in the whole, or least part) incumbent upon them, by which price already paid and accepted liberty is impetrated, or procured for them, yet not actually or absolutely to be enjoyed by them, but upon certain (not uncertain as this Author says p. 37.) conditions agreed upon betwixt God and Christ, and declared in the Gospel, upon the fulfilling of which conditions we do not say, as this Author would have us say, viz. *that a sinners redemption doth depend, but upon which their actual enjoyment of the benefit of their redemption doth depend.*

In page 78. he calumniates us in saying, That we agree with the Papists in this, that both of us do make mans righteousness the immediate formal cause of justification, for which we are accepted.

Answ. It is falsly said of his Brethren, that they make their own righteousness the formal

formal cauſe of juſtification, remiſſion of ſin being it, which as they ſay, doth conſtitute, or is the formal cauſe of Goſpel-juſtification.

2. *The things here charged upon us are incompatible, it being a naturally impoſſibility, that our own righteouſneſs ſhould at once be both the formal cauſe of juſtification and that alſo for which we are juſtified, foraſmuch as in that caſe it would be a thing both intrinſecal and extrinſecal thereunto: for as a cauſe, for which being an efficient cauſe, is always extrinſecal to the effect, ſo a formal cauſe is always intrinſecal thereunto, it doth* ingredi naturam rei.

3. *We make our inherent righteouſneſs no other than a condition of our pardon, and acceptance with God, or a means of Gods appointment in order to our acceptance with him for the ſake of Chriſts righteouſneſs, according to the tenour of Gods promiſe to ſinners, If we do well, we ſhall be accepted,* Gen. 4. 8. *from which and the like conditional promiſes we doubt not to ſay, That well doing is a condition requiſite on our part, that for Chriſts ſake we may be, and without which we ſhall not be accepted with God.*

He ſays of us, p. 81. That we make obedience the cauſe of juſtification in the ſame manner, that all Proteſtants affirm Chriſts

Christs righteousnes to be, and is put into the room of it, *viz.* That we are not justified by Christs righteousnes trusted in, but by fulfilling the commands of the Gospel. Now Christs righteousnes is a proper cause of justification, not onely *Conditio sine qua non.*

Answ. 1. *It is a notorious calumny, that we put our obedience in the room of Christs righteousnes, which we with all Protestants do constantly affirm to be the meritorious cause and not onely a condition, or a condition simply so called, such as mans obedience is.*

2. *As Christs righteousnes and our obedience have a site peculiar to each (the one being in the series of a meritorious cause, the other of a bare simple condition) so by our Doctrine we preserve them in their proper place and for their proper purposes, putting neither of them out of place, and much les placing the latter in the room of the former, and we do assert withal a different manner of operation according to their different nature, the one having the nature of a meer condition, the other of a cause meritorious.*

3. *It is falsly here said, That according to our Doctrine we are not justified by Christs righteousnes, but by fulfilling the commands of the Gospel: for our Doctrine is, That we are not justified by, or upon the fulfillin-*

filling this one, or this onely command of the Goſpel, that bids us to truſt in the righteouſonſneſs of Chriſt, but upon the fulfilling of other Goſpel commands, ſuch as Act. 3. 19. (Repent and be converted) *pardon of ſin being promiſed in the Goſpel not meerly to the fulfilling of the former ſingle command, but to that in conjunction with theſe, upon which performance we are juſtified for the righteouſneſs ſake of Chriſt.*

To the inſtances foregoing I might add very many others of the like nature diſperſed here and there his book throughout, wherein he miſrepreſenteth the Doctrine of his adverſaries, and miſ-ſtates the Queſtion, or Queſtions under debate, whereby alſo the intelligent Reader may eaſily obſerve, that very much of his arguings do not touch the true ſtate of the matters in queſtion. But to prevent the exceſſive lengthning of this Epiſtle, I ſhall omit the mention of them, and proceed to the third thing promiſed.

3. *I am now to reply to ſuch paſſages in this Authors book; wherein I find my ſelf by name excepted againſt, the firſt whereof is in* p. 4. 5. *where to manifeſt, that many of his adverſaries are of this opinion,* viz. *That pardon and life are promiſed to them that believe and obey the Goſpel, by, or upon both which a man is juſtified, pardoned and accepted with God, he brings in my ſelf for an inſtance in the*

first place, saying, Mr *Hotchkis* in a Treatise purposely written for this opinion thus delivers himself *Disc. p.* 59. The law, by which a sinner is justified, is an evangelical law, the law of the Gospel: The law, whereby a sinner [I did not say a sinner, but a man] was and is to be justified, is twofold,

1. The law of God Creator commonly styled *Lex originalis*, or law of works.

2. The law of God Redeemer called *Lex Remedians*, or a law of grace, or faith; the formal law was exacted as the rule of justifying an innocent person, and the latter of a sinner; *from which words of mine thus recited he infers, saying* p. 5.

Hence it is evident according to this Author, that faith and obedience to the Gospel are the righteousness of a sinner, whereby he is justified in the same manner as perfect obedience should have been his righteousness and have justified him by the law of works.

Answ. *Hence indeed (I confess) it is most evident, that whereas there was one kind of righteousness (commonly styled legal righteousness, which consists in obedience absolutely perfect) required in the law of works, whereby innocent man was to be justified, there is now in the law of grace and faith no such righteousness required of us for that end: the right-*e-

righteouſneſs therein required of us as the condition of our being juſtified, ſaved, or accepted unto life by God, conſiſting in a return to God by faith, repentance and new obedience. This I ſay is evident from my words.

But it is not in any ſort from thence evident, as this Author ſuggeſteth, viz. *That according to me a ſinner by his faith and obedience to the Goſpel is juſtified in the ſame manner, as man innocent would, or ſhould have been juſtified by perfect obedience: for,*

1. *A ſinner by the means of his faith and obedience to the Goſpel (his evangelical righteouſneſs) and an innocent man by his perfect obedience to the law of works (his legal righteouſneſs) is not juſtified in the ſame manner, nor with the ſame ſort of juſtification, but with a juſtification of a far different kind, the former being a juſtification* A reatu pœnæ, *from guilt of puniſhment, the latter* A reatu culpæ, *from guilt of fault. I do truly remember, that this diſtinction of* Reatus culpæ & pœnæ, *is cenſured by Dr.* Owen *in his late book, to be a diſtinction without a difference (* Inanis, *ſays he,* ſine mente ſonus;*) but for my own part I think, that the difference betwixt them is to the underſtanding of any unprejudicate perſon as diſcernable as is the difference betwixt the precept and the ſanction (the preceptive and the remunerative part) of Gods law; guilt of fault being*

the result of the precept of the law as transgressed, and guilt, or obligation to punishment being the result or consequent of the comminatory part of the law. And as the person justified is (innocent, or not innocent) such I say is his justification, if innocent, his justification is from the guilt of fault and by the law of works, if nocent, or a sinner, his justification is, and can be no other absolutely, than from the guilt of punishment and by the law of grace or faith

2. *The former justification* (viz. *of a sinner*) *for the manner of it is* (*to speak simply, and precisely*) *arbitrary and of free grace, the latter*, viz. *of an innocent person would have been necessary and of strict justice.*

3. *The said two kinds of righteousneß* (*legal and evangelical*) *referring to the two different Covenants of Law and Gospel, do save, or justifie a person after this different manner*, viz. *Perfect legal righteousness would have justified man*, Vi suâ intrinsecâ, propriâ, et u innatâ, *by its innate worth, of it self and without the intervention of any gracious promise from God in Christ, but the said evangelical righteousness doth justifie, or save a sinner*, Vi tantum aliunde illatâ, i. e. *onely by vertue of Christs merit and Gods merciful promise in him: for if God had not preordained, or set forth Jesus Christ to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, that he might*

might be juſt and the juſtifier of him, who is of the faith of Jeſus, faith would not, faith could not have juſtified, or ſaved any ſinner; this being one of thoſe four things, wherein this Author doth acknowledg an agreement on both ſides, (*p.* 3.) viz. *That neither faith, nor obedience, apart, or together could juſtifie a ſinner were it not for the merit of the death of Chriſt, who hath purchaſed, that we ſhould be reconciled to God this way.*

The Author proceeds to recite two paſſages (*in my Diſcourſe, p.* 23 *and* 43.) *wherein although I deny, that we are made righteous with the perfect righteouſneſs of Chriſt imputed to us, I do nevertheleſs acknowledg, that Chriſts righteouſneſs is the external impulſive, or meritorious cauſe of our juſtification; from whence this Author infers, ſaying, page* 6.

But when he ſaith, Chriſts righteouſs is the impulſive meritorious cauſe of our juſtification, he meaneth, Chriſt merited, that we ſhould be juſtified by faith and goſpel obedience.

Anſw. 1. *There be thoſe, who although they will acknowledg Chriſts righteouſneſs to be the meritorious cauſe of our juſtification, will nevertheleſs deny, that by that acknowledgment they mean, That Jeſus Chriſt did merit for us the Covenant of grace, or the gracious terms of our being juſtified according*

the result of the precept of the law as transgressed, and guilt, or obligation to punishment being the result or consequent of the comminatory part of the law. And as the person justified is (innocent, or not innocent) such I say is his justification, if innocent, his justification is from the guilt of fault and by the law of works, if nocent, or a sinner, his justification is, and can be no other absolutely, than from the guilt of punishment and by the law of grace or faith

2. *The former justification* (viz. *of a sinner*) *for the manner of it is* (*to speak simply, and precisely*) *arbitrary and of free grace, the latter*, viz. *of an innocent person would have been necessary and of strict justice.*

3. *The said two kinds of righteousneſs* (*legal and evangelical*) *referring to the two different Covenants of Law and Goſpel, do save, or justifie a person after this different manner*, viz. *Perfect legal righteousneſs would have justified man*, Vi ſuâ intrinſecâ, propriâ, ex innatâ, *by its innate worth, of it ſelf and without the intervention of any gracious promiſe from God in Chriſt, but the ſaid evangelical righteousneſs doth justifie, or ſave a ſinner*, Vi tantum aliunde illatâ, i. e. *onely by vertue of Chriſts merit and Gods merciful promiſe in him: for if God had not preordained, or ſet forth Jeſus Chriſt to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, that he might*

might be juſt and the juſtifier of him, who is of the faith of Jeſus, faith would not, faith could not have juſtified, or ſaved any ſinner; this being one of thoſe four things, wherein this Author doth acknowledg an agreement on both ſides, (*p.* 3.) viz. *That neither faith, nor obedience, apart, or together could juſtifie a ſinner were it not for the merit of the death of Chriſt, who hath purchaſed, that we ſhould be reconciled to God this way.*

The Author proceeds to recite two paſſages (*in my Diſcourſe, p.* 23 *and* 43.) *wherein although I deny, that we are made righteous with the perfect righteouſneſs of Chriſt imputed to us, I do nevertheleſs acknowledg, that Chriſts righteouſneſs is the external impulſive, or meritorious cauſe of our juſtification; from whence this Author infers, ſaying, page* 6.

But when he ſaith, Chriſts righteouſs is the impulſive meritorious cauſe of our juſtification, he meaneth, Chriſt merited, that we ſhould be juſtified by faith and goſpel obedience.

Anſw. 1. *There be thoſe, who although they will acknowledg Chriſts righteouſneſs to be the meritorious cauſe of our juſtification, will nevertheleſs deny, that by that acknowledgment they mean, That Jeſus Chriſt did merit for us the Covenant of grace, or the gracious terms of our being juſtified according*

to the tenour of this Covenant, I ſhall onely inſtance in two learned and well read late Writers (Dr Owen *and the Author of* Antizozzo*) who will deny, that Jeſus Chriſt did by his merits procure for ſinners the covenant of grace, they herein concurring with* Socinas: *for this Author ſays, p.* 90. *concerning Mr* Baxter, *Mr* Truman *and my ſelf with the reſt oppoſed by him in his book, that we and* Socinas *do differ in this main point.* Socinas (*ſays he*) ſaith, That God of his meer mercy without any reſpect to the death of Chriſt granted the Goſpel terms of life. But ours teach, that God granted the terms of the new covenant for the ſake of the death of Chriſt, that he fulfilled ſo much of the law and bare ſo much of the curſe, as God thought fit, that ſo that law (That is, as a covenant of works) might be taken out of the way, and a new one eſtabliſhed upon milder Conditions.

2. *But for my own part I do acknowledg, that in ſaying, that Chriſts righteouſneſs is the impulſive meritorious cauſe of our juſtification my meaning therein implyed is, That Jeſus Chriſt did merit that we ſhould be juſtified upon milder terms, than thoſe of the covenant of works,* viz. *by, or upon faith in Chriſt, our obedience to him being therein included. And I did aſſert this to be my judgment in the ſame words as this Author recites*

cites them (out of my Diſcourſe, p. 8.) in the true recital whereof, p. 6. he hath not wronged me at all; and as I there ſaid, ſo I ſay ſtill, That Chriſt, fulfilling the law of his Mediatorſhip was accepted of God, not as our fulfilling either of that law, or any other law whatſoever (for the law of Mediatorſhip belonged not to us, it being peculiar to Chriſt himſelf) but it was reckoned, reputed or accepted by God as a ſatisfaction for our not fulfilling the law of God impoſed upon mankind, I mean the law in the rigour of it, or as a Covenant of works, and that ſuch an exact fulfulling of the law ſhould not be exacted of us as the covenanted condition of our ſalvation, but that faith and ſincere obedience to the Goſpel of Chriſt ſhould be ſo required. And I do not perceive, how this Author can with ſelf conſiſtency deny what I have here ſaid once and again, although he doth profeſſedly oppoſe it; for (as was before related) he confeſſeth it, p. 3. to be a truth agreed upon on all ſides, That neither faith nor obedience apart, or together, could juſtifie a ſinner, were it not for the merit of the death of Chriſt, who hath purchaſed that we ſhould be reconciled to God this way; from which words thus recited as the agreement on both ſides we may certainly conclude this to be the Authors ſenſe, or opinion, viz. That Jeſus Chriſt hath purchaſed by his death, that we ſhould

be reconciled to God by the way of faith and obedience; and to say thus is all one in effect as to say, That Christ hath purchased by his death, that we should be justified and saved upon the condition of Faith and Evangelical obedience. And this is that, which Mr Truman *says (Great Propit. page. 69.) is the immediate effect of Christs satisfaction as satisfaction, and which is an essential consequent as a satisfaction to justice, it is only this, That that obstacle being removed, he might be at liberty to act in the pardon of sinners in what way, and upon what termes he pleased. He doth not say (as this Author objects against him and others) that the onely thing, which Christ by his merit procured for sinners was a conditional covenant of grace, or that sinners might be saved upon new and gracious terms, but that this procurement was the immediate effect of his bloodshed, precisely considered as a satisfaction to Gods justice, he meaning thereby, as he doth express the matter in his following words (which this Author is not so ingenuous to this his deceased Brother as to take notice, or to give notice of) not that God must pardon sinners, come what will of it, or be unjust, nor that sinners* ipso facto *should be pardoned upon the price being undertaken, paid and accepted, but onely conditionally, or upon the performance of such terms, as in the covenant of grace are expressed.*

The

The next place, where I find my name mentioned is in p. 229. *where by occaſion of my anſwer to that Scripture*, Rom. 5. 18. *alledged by Dr* Owen, *to prove, that we are juſtified with the righteouſneſs of Chriſt in its formal, or eſſential nature imputed to us, and my anſwer being this*, viz. *That the Apoſtle doth not ſay, as the Doctor would have him, with whoſe obedience, but by whoſe obedience we are made righteous, the two particles* (*By and With*) *differing in ſignification, By implying the nature, energy, or intereſt of an efficient, and as there implyed, a meritorious cauſe, and the latter particle* (*With*) *the nature and intereſt of a formal cauſe, by occaſion I ſay of this my anſwer to that allegation of the Doctors, this Author replies in ſaying in the following words.*

A learned man (Mr *Hotchkis, ut ſupra* p. 43.) ſaith, we are juſtified by Chriſts righteouſneſs, or obedience, but not with it: for ſaith he, By, in this controverſie denoteth an efficient and meritorious cauſe, With, the formal. Young Sophiſters know, that *cauſa per quam*, By which is the formal cauſe, and the efficient is *cauſa a qua*, of which, not by which properly (though ſometimes ſo expreſſed in *Engliſhed*) yet a meritorious cauſe in *Engliſh* muſt not be ſo expreſſed. Moreover *cauſa cum qua*, with which, is in no language a formal, but an inſtru-

inſtrumental cauſe, which is reduced to the efficient and ſometimes it ſignifies a bare concomitancy. *e. g.* A man is a man by his ſoul, not with his ſoul. A man is righteous by righteouſneſs, not with righteouſneſs. On the other ſide man writeth with his hand, with his pen as inſtruments, or a man writeth with his head, *i. e.* not without it. With what a wet finger doth this Author wipe away all the Scriptures which can ſay, Weare juſtified, or made righteous by the obedience righteouſneſs, or death of Chriſt?

Anſw. 1. *I grant it indeed as a thing well known by men generally (whether Sophiſters, or no Sophiſters) that as the Greek particles ἐν, ἐν, ἐξ, &c., ſo the Engliſh particles, of, for, from, by and with are oft times uſed promiſcuouſly and to expreſs ſometimes one and the ſelf ſame cauſe, and ſometimes divers kinds of cauſes, and ſometimes no proper cauſe at all, but barely a condition, or ſome concomitant thing, and therefore as I did not then, ſo neither do I now deny, but that the particles (By and With) may in ſome caſes be uſed indifferently. Nevertheleſs if any one ſhall aſſert concerning Chriſts righteouſneſs, as Doctor* Owen *doth Com. p.* 200. *that we are By it and With it perfectly accepted, or juſtified by God (the Doctors true meaning in ſuch his ſayings being this,* viz.

That

That Chriſts righteouſneſs is not onely the meritorious cauſe, but alſo the formal cauſe of our juſtification, or that we are made righteous with Chriſts righteouſneſs in its formal nature imputed to us) and if any one for the proof of this aſſertion ſhall, as the Doctor did, alledge that Scripture in Rom. 5. 18. *I ſtill think, that I may fitly make anſwer to that, or any other the like Scriptural allegation, as I did in that page of my Diſcourſe,* viz. *That it doth not prove the Doctors purpoſe, nor is it pertinent thereunto, the Queſtion in hand not being this,* viz. *Whether we are juſtified By, or for the righteouſneſs of Chriſt as the meritorious cauſe of our juſtification, but whether we are juſtified With it, this particle With being taken in way of contradiſtinction to the particle By in this controverſie, as importing the intereſt of a formal cauſe.*

2. *Though I do in part grant what the Author here ſays,* viz. *That the particle with doth ſometimes ſignifie an inſtrumental efficiency and ſometimes onely a bare concomitancy, nevertheleſs I deny the truth of his ſaying, That* cauſa cum qua *doth in no language import a formal cauſe, and I do affirm the contrary, it being apparent by many ſuch inſtances as theſe.* e. g. *A whited wall is made white with whiteneſs, A wiſe man is made wiſe with wiſdome and if I am indeed (as this Author in his obliging civility and*

charity

charity hath ſtyled me) *a learned man, it may be truly and fitly ſaid, that I am made learned with learning. Yea I may ſuggeſt the inſtances ſpecified here by this Author for himſelf, againſt him, and ſay, That a man is a man with his ſoul, and a man is righteous with righteouſneſs; for in theſe ſayings, as the ſoul is the ſubſtantial form, or that, which together with its matter* [*the body*] *doth conſtitute man, or make him to be what he is,* viz. *man, ſo are whiteneſs, wiſdom, learning, righteouſneſs the accidental forms, that* (*according to the properties of all forms*) *do firſt conſtitute and then denominate a thing or perſon, white, wiſe, learned, righteous, whiteneſs, wiſdom, learning being in the predicament of Qualities, all Qualities being Accidental Forms, as this Author hath truly ſaid p.* 168. *and which ſaying of his own he may do well here to call to mind, and apply to the caſe in hand. The premiſſes conſidered, it may appear, that I have not wiped away that in* Rom. 5. 18. *or any the like Scriptures with a wet finger* (*as is this Authors cenſure, and expreſſion*) *inſtead whereof others* (*as I am perſwaded*) *will ſay, That I have dextrouſly put by or put off that and the like Scriptures as impertinently alledged for Doctor* Owens *purpoſe, or not pertaining to the Queſtion under debate; the Queſtion in hand not being concerning the meri-*

meritorious cauſe of our juſtification [*Whether we be juſtified, or made righteous by Chriſts righteouſneſs*] *but concerning the formal cauſe, Whether we are made righteous with it*, i.e. *with the very thing it ſelf imputed, or with the imputation of it in its formal and eſſential nature to us, which manner of imputation as I ſaid then, ſo I ſay again, that Scripture in* Rom. 5. 18. *doth not evince, nor any other Scripture, that I as yet am privy to.*

The laſt place wherein I find my ſelf dealt with by name is in p. 231. *where he doth except againſt me and Mr* Truman, *and others of us, in that we affirm, That the juſtification of a ſinner is all one with pardon of ſin, he quoting certain paſſages out of mine and Mr* Trumans *books to manifeſt that to be the thing affirmed by us.*

Anſw. *To this his exception I cannot but reply in the way of wonder, it being matter of a kind of aſtoniſhment to me* (*as I think it will be alſo to every conſiderate Reader*) *that he ſhould except againſt us, or any of us for affirming that the juſtification of a ſinner is all one with pardon of ſin, foraſmuch as he himſelf hath little leſs than ten times either in plain terms, or in effect and tantamount in his book expreſſed his concurrence with us in that aſſertion, See p.* 97. *and* 163. *and* 172. *and* 149. An offender,

(*ſays*

ſays he in the place laſt quoted) is uſually juſtified, that is, Forgiven and reſtored into favour by ſome grant. *and p.* 156. The Queſtion, *ſays he, ſpeaking concerning* Jam. 2. 14. is, Whether a man be not juſtified, that is, pardoned through the righteouſneſs of Chriſt by believing--- Yea, p. 221. *he ſays*, That *David* himſelf placeth juſtification in forgiveneſs of ſin, *Rom.* 4. 6, 7. And again, *ſays he, quoting the ſame Text*, p. 199. Juſtification, or imputation of righteouſneſs to a believer is a forgiving of ſin, covering iniquity, not imputing ſin.

What can be more plainly ſpoken in the way of acknowledgment, That juſtification, now imputation of ſin and imputation of righteouſneſs are all one, than what hath been recited, from the Pen of this Author? And I am the rather glad for his expreſs concurrence with me therein for theſe two reaſons,

1. *Becauſe it is one main part of my profeſſed deſign in this ſecond part of my Diſcourſe to prove* (*and which I hope, I have done effectually*) *That forgiveneſs of ſin is that very righteouſneſs, which is ſaid in Scripture for the ſake of Chriſt's righteouſneſs to be imputed to ſinners by God.*

2. *Becauſe hereby it is apparent, that in our aſſerting repentance for ſin, and a ſincere purpoſe of amendment together with faith to be duties required by God, that we may be juſti-*

juſtified at preſent and that perſeverance in faith and holineſs are required in Gods word, that we may continue, or be continued in that eſtate, we do aſſert no more, nor any other thing than this, viz. *That the ſaid graces, or duties are commanded by God, that thereupon a ſinner may according to the tenour of his promiſe be pardoned and eternally ſaved. And this very doctrine being it, which this Author doth ſo zealouſly oppoſe and endeavour by his book to extirpate, I leave it unto every impartial Reader to judge what manner of task he hath undertaken in his book, it being (as he ſays p. 16) an endeavour to ſhew, That the foreſaid doctrine concerning faith and works as the neceſſary conditions, or requiſits in order to the obtaining and retaining the pardon of our ſins, that this our doctrine,*

1. *Doth greatly diminiſh the work of Redemption.*

2. *That it leadeth to Arminianiſm.*

3. *That it is the ſame doctrine for ſubſtance with that of the Papiſt.*

4. *That it is a high way to Socinianiſm.*

And verily when he hath effected theſe things, which his profeſſed endeavour is by the grace of Chriſt to ſhew, we may give him leave to ſay, That he hath demonſtrated our ſaid Doctrine to be the high way to hell and leading down to the chambers of death.

The

The premiſſes conſidered, I cannot but ſay again, as I ſaid before, that I wonder greatly, that he ſhould except againſt me, or any of my Brethren for affirming that thing which himſelf in ſo many places of his book doth affirm alſo, viz. *That a ſinners juſtification is all one with forgiveneſs of ſin; ſo that we may reſt fully aſſured, that this Author can object nothing againſt this aſſertion of his brethren, but what will touch or recoil upon himſelf, and that he and we muſt in this point of our agreement either ſtand, or fall together, it being as impoſſible for him to confound us herein without confounding himſelf, even as it was not poſſible for* Samſon *without killing himſelf to kill his enemies, the Philiſtines. However it may be worth while to relate what he ſays againſt the common faith both of himſelf and his brethren in the foreſaid Article and to ſhape a reply thereunto, as followeth.*

Now I demand, *ſays he p.* 232. If juſtification be nothing but pardon, whether it be an abſolute pardon, or on condition onely?

Anſw. *Foraſmuch as juſtification and Remiſſion of ſin are like* Pharaohs *two dreams,* viz. *One in ſenſe and ſignification, ſo that though the words ſignifying be two, yet the thing ſignified is but one, they are both alike diſtinguiſhable into Abſolute and Conditional;*

al; whereupon I ſhall directly anſwer this Authors demand by downright ſaying, That conditional juſtification is all one with conditional pardon, and abſolute or actual juſtification (for when the condition is fulfilled, the thing conditioned ipſo facto *becomes abſolute) is all one with actual, or abſolute pardon; this anſwer is enough in all reaſon to put a ſtop to his after arguings; nevertheleſs it may be uſeful in ſome reſpects to recite them, as I find them in the ſame Page, and to reply thereunto.*

If abſolute (*ſays he*) then what cometh of all their doctrine of works being the condition? If God for the ſake of Chriſts death grant remiſſion of ſins and right to life abſolutely, then theſe can depend upon no condition to be fulfilled by men; and Chriſt muſt have purchaſed more than a grant of life upon condition, even life it ſelf to be given to whom he pleaſed.

Anſw. 1. *Neither did God for the ſake of Chriſts death ever promiſe, covenant or grant, neither did Chriſt purchaſe, or ever intend to purchaſe remiſſion of ſin, juſtification, or a right to life to be enjoyed abſolutely by ſinners,* i. e. *without any condition to be fulfilled by them in order to ſuch enjoyment.*

2. *When the conditions upon which the enjoyment of the ſaid juſtification, remiſſion of ſin and right to life purchaſed by Chriſt,*

and promiſed by God are by ſinners fulfilled, then doth the ſaid grant, or promiſe, which was before onely conditional, become abſolute, that is, the things granted or benefits promiſed come to be actually and abſolutely enjoyed, which abſolute enjoyment Chriſt Jeſus did indeed purchaſe for ſinners, yet not that they ſhould enjoy the ſame immediately upon his purchaſe, but in conſequence upon their fulfilling ſuch, and ſuch conditions of divine inſtitution.

3. *Although Chriſt purchaſed heaven, or life it ſelf to be given to whom he pleaſed, yet it did not pleaſe him, to give it meerly arbitrarily, and without reaſon. Thus ſays this Author, p.*156. God proceedeth with equity in giving heaven to them, who have believed and been obedient, and he doth not give it meerly arbitrarily and without reaſon.

Briefly, As Chriſt purchaſed heaven to be given To whom he pleaſed, ſo to be given How and when he pleaſeth, i. e. *not preſently and not otherwiſe than upon the performance of the conditions of his own and his fathers appointment.*

The Anthor proceeds to ſay of us in the following words.

But if they ſay, That juſtification is pardon upon condition, that men fulfill the Goſpel-terms, it is a contradiction in *adjecto*,

to

to be nothing but pardon, and yet to require obedience as the condition of it, are inconsistent, pardon being nothing else, but *Nolle punire*, a will not to punish, and to require conditions of new obedience being a prescribing of a new law, by which they shall be judged both for what was past before their justification and for what follows after.

Answ. 1. *Although we say, that Gospel-justification and pardon of sin are the same thing, and though we say, That justification conditional, and conditional pardon are the same thing, as also, That justification actual is the same thing with actual pardon, nevertheless we do not say,, as this Author here supposes, or would have us to say*, viz. *That actual justification is the same thing with conditional pardon, or with pardon upon condition, that men fulfill the Gospel-terms.*

2. *Although it be a contradiction to say, that actual, or absolute justification is pardon upon condition of our fulfilling the Gospel-terms, yet it is no contradiction to say, That justification conditional is pardon of sin upon condition, that we fulfill the Gospel-terms. And forasmuch as this Author doth rightly describe a legal condition*, (*saying, p.* 45. It is the condition of a law or covenant, whereupon some thing is promised.) *I judge it to be a great mistake in him to deny the Gospel*

to be a new law, wherein a return to God by faith, and repentance and new obedience is preſcribed as the condition, upon which juſtification, remiſſion of ſin, and a right to life are for the ſake of Chriſt promiſed to be conferred upon ſinners.

3. *It is his errour to ſay, that pardon is but* Nolle punire, *a will not to puniſh, which errour I have at large refuted in my Exercitation concerning the nature of forgiveneſs of ſin, p.* 209. *Pardon of ſin is the actual diſſolution of a ſinners obligation to puniſhment, which doth indeed as much differ from Gods* Nolle punire, *as doth Gods will, or purpoſe to do a thing differ from the thing done, or from his actual effecting the deed.*

4. *Suppoſe, that pardon were but Gods* Nolle punire, *it doth not from thence follow, but that God may by a law preſcribe conditions, upon which the thing willed by him is to be enjoyed, and according to which law ſinners muſt finally be judged.*

He proceeds to ſay of us, p. 232, 233.

They ſay, That when a man is pardoned all his ſins, it is all one as if he had done all his duty and fulfilled the law. Then to juſtifie a man is to account him guiltleſs and in effect to have fulfilled the law, and how can this be without imputing Chriſts ſatisfaction, or fulfilling the law to him? But it is apparently untrue, that to pardon

is

is all one as to account a man guiltleſs, or to have done his duty: for confeſſion of guilt and ſin muſt go before and accompany pardon and the law, which a man hath broken, doth ſtill accuſe, and condemn him for the breach of it: Sin is ſtill ſin and deſerves death though forgiven, though the law-maker being above the law will not ſuffer the law to have its courſe upon the offender.

Anſw. 1. *We do not ſay, as is here inſinuated of us,* viz. *That when a man is pardoned all his ſins, it is (ſimply, abſolutely, univerſally, or in all reſpects) all one as if he had done all his duty and fulfilled the law: But the thing we ſay is this, That when a man is pardoned all his ſins, it is all one reſpectively to a ſinners impunity, or freedome from ſuffering, as if he had done all his duty, or (which is to the ſame purpoſe) this we ſay,* viz. *When a ſinner is perfectly pardoned, he is dealt with reſpectively to the puniſhment contracted by his ſins, as if he had never ſinned. And the truth of this ſaying this Author cannot deny without ſelf-contradiction, foraſmuch as he doth expreſly acknowledg, p.* 199. *that to impute righteouſneſs, and not to impute or pardon ſin are all one.*

2. *As upon the reaſon here ſpecified by this Author, we do not ſay, that when a man is fully pardoned all his ſins, it is all one (ſimply and abſolutely, or in all imaginable re-*

ſpects) as if he had done all his duty, ſo for the ſame reaſon we neither do, or dare ſay, that it is thus all one with a ſinner fully pardoned upon the imputation of Chriſts ſatisfaction and fulfilling the law to him, though this Author ſeems to ſay that it may be done upon this account: for we do judge it a natural impoſſibility, that he, who hath ſinned, and is become guilty, ſhould upon any account whatſoever be, or be truly accounted guiltleſs, i. e. guiltleſs in reſpect of fault, that is, never to have ſinned, or to have always done all his duty, It being truly ſaid by this Author, That ſin is ſtill ſin and deſerves death though forgiven; and it is alſo truly ſaid by him, that to pardon cannot be all one as to account a man guiltleſs or to have done all his duty, for this reaſon, viz. Becauſe confeſſion of guilt and ſin go before and accompany pardon. But withall I obſerve, that in that ſaying he hath contradicted what he ſaid elſewhere, p. 76. where although he acknowledges repentance for ſin to be a thing requiſite conſequently to a ſinners pardon, yet he denies it to be requiſite antecedently thereunto. I know no way poſſible in theſe two places to make this Author conſiſtent with himſelf, but by ſaying, That by confeſſion of guilt and ſin he doth not mean a penitential confeſſion thereof, which meaning, I preſume, he would with indignation diſown, forasmuch

as

as it is palbably againſt reaſon and againſt the truth of the Goſpel to ſay, That confeſſion of guilt and ſin is to go before pardon, but a penitential confeſſion of it muſt not.

Now whereas this Author in the following pages having objected it as the opinion of the carnal multitude, that they ſhall be ſaved for their good works through the mercy of God, and becauſe Chriſt died for them, doth, notwithſtanding their renouncing the merits of their works and truſting thereunto, doth I ſay diſallow all manner of truſting to our good works, as they are the performance of the conditions of the new covenant, I will therefore recite his words and reply thereunto.

Mans reaſon and conſcience (*ſays he, p.* 234, 235.) if it may be heard, will allow him to truſt no further to his works, than as they are the fulfilling of Gods commands, *i. e.* as they are the conditions of the covenant, as theſe Writers expreſs it, and unſanctified reaſon ignorant of the righteouſneſs of God, will not ſuffer them to truſt in Chriſt without the concomitance of their own works.

Anſw. 1. *Although it is the vain opinion and damnable preſumption of the carnal multitude (like thoſe Profeſſors of Piety, yet Workers of Iniquity,* Mat. 7, 21, 22, 23.) *to truſt that they ſhall be ſaved through the mer-*

cy of God and merits of Chriſt upon account of their doing ſome external works pertaining to Chriſtian Religion. Nevertheleſs this Author hath no juſt ground to rebuke the hope and truſt of ſincere Believers, who do believe and truſt, that through the mercy of God and merits of Chriſt they ſhall be ſaved by their good works, i. e. by their faithful performance of the conditions of the new covenant, or by their patient continuance in well doing, as is the Apoſtles expreſſion, Rom. 2. 7. *Yea this Author cannot without ſelf-contradiction deny, that a ſincere Chriſtian may be truly ſaid, through Gods mercy and Chriſts merits to be ſaved for his good works, foraſmuch as he doth acknowledge, p.* 141, *that the word* (for) *aſſigns a reaſon of a thing affirmed, and not always a cauſe, according to the logical expreſſion of the matter,* Conſequentiam denotat, non cauſam, *and upon that ground he ſays, p.* 148. *that he humbly conceives, That although to vulgar ears, it be ſafeſt to ſay, We are ſaved according to our works* (they being good and not evil;) *nevertheleſs in diſputation We need not fear to ſay, They are actually ſaved for their works; and indeed that very reaſon, which he gives, p.* 156. *why the faithful may be ſaid to be judged to ſalvation according to their works, is a cogent reaſon, why they may warrantably be ſaid to be ſaved*

By,

By, or For their works, viz. *becauſe God (as he ſays moſt truly) proceeds with equity in giving heaven to the obedient, and that he doth not give it meerly arbitrarily and without reaſon; God hereby manifeſting (as he ſays, p. 148.) that he is not partial giving heaven meerly upon favour to perſons, that are as bad as others, but that there is ſome fitneſs in thoſe perſons in their diſpoſitions and practices.*

2. *As ſanctified reaſon and conſcience illuminated by the ſacred Scriptures will allow a Chriſtian to truſt to his works no further, than as they are the fulfilling the conditions of the new covenant, to, or upon which juſtification, remiſſion of ſin and eternal life are therein promiſed, ſo the ſame ſanctified reaſon and conſcience will warrant him ſo far forth to truſt unto them and for the obtaining of ſo much as God hath promiſed to, or upon that performance, it being no leſs than juſtification, remiſſion of ſin and eternal life. And indeed in this ſort, or thus far forth to truſt unto our works (as they are the performance of the covenant on our part, in which covenant, or to which performance all good things are promiſed on Gods part) is in effect neither more, nor leſs and in true conſtruction, than to truſt God upon his word, or to God for the accompliſhment of his own word and promiſe in his own appointed way, or upon his own terms.*

3. *It*

3. *It is not unſanctified reaſon, ignorant of the righteouſneſs of God, that will not ſuffer ſinners to truſt in Chriſt without the comitancy of their own works, but it is reaſon ſanctified and illightned by the knowledg of God in Chriſt and his holy Goſpel, reveaſing and preſcribing to us the terms of ſalvation through Chriſt, that will not ſuffer any ſinner to truſt in Chriſt for ſalvation without the concomitance of their own good works, or (to ſpeak in the language of Scripture,* Heb. 6. 9.) *without ſuch works, which do accompany ſalvation, the κρείττονα, thoſe Better things, which the Apoſtle there ſpeaks of. And the contrary may eaſily be manifeſted to be a doctrine of unſufferable preſumption and not of the true Scriptural truſt in Chriſt, and ſuch doctrine, which was never taught by the Proteſtant Churches: for the Proteſtant doctrine in this matter (as I have always apprehended it, notwithſtanding all the gainſayings and foul aſperſions of the Papiſts) is truly this,* viz. *That without the concomitancy, or preſence of good works neither is Chriſt Jeſus to be truſted unto for ſalvation, nor is faith to be truſted unto for juſtification. Hereupon I leave it to every intelligent Reader to judg whether this Author by this his Anti-proteſtant doctrine hath not greatly wronged and diſhonoured the Proteſtant cauſe, which in the point of juſtification by faith he pretends to main-*

tain and vindicate. What wrong he hath done our Proteſtant Churches by the manifold falſe doctrine diſperſed in his book, I will endeavour to manifeſt in the fourth thing, which I promiſed and which I am in the next place to enter upon.

4. *Under this head let be conſidered in the firſt place, what he ſays reſpectively to the perſeverance of the Saints,*

1. *As he aſſerts in p* 206. (*as alſo elſewhere*) That there is no danger of their Apoſtacy, nor poſſibility of it, *p.* 200. *ſo he blames us for ſuppoſing it poſſible, and ſays withall,* That to aſſert their final condemnation upon ſuppoſition of their actual Apoſtacy, is prodigious divinity.

This Doctrine of his I take to be no Proteſtant, or Scripture Doctrine; for if (*to ſpeak ſimply*) *there were no danger, nor poſſibility of their damnable backſliding, in vain and altogether without cauſe would thoſe and multitude of the like admonitions be,* Heb. 4. 1. *and* 12. 15, 16. 2 Joh. 8. Rev. 3. 11. *And it is plain Scripture Divinity to aſſert the damnation of the Saints upon ſuppoſition of their Apoſtacy, as appears by the Scriptures both of the Old and New Teſtament,* 1 Chron. 28. 9. Ezek. 18. 24. Rom. 8. 13. Heb. 10. lat. *Nor do the* Dort-*Synodiſts* (*for ought I know*) *deny the Divinity, which this Author calls prodigious, to be ſcriptural;*

ſure

ſure and certain I am, that our Britiſh *Divines (Members of that Synod) do not deny it, yea they do aſſert the contrary.*

2. *In p.* 209. *he doth in effect plainly aſſert,* That as God doth purpoſe to give life to ſome men, excluding all reſpects to their works (which is their election) ſo he will certainly in time give them an actual right to life, and put them into an eſtate of life without reſpect to their works, which, ſays he, is juſtification.

This, I am well aſſured, is no part of Proteſtant, nor yet of School-divinity; for though Aquinas *with ſome other School-men do deny, That* Deus propter hoc vult hoc (*wherein notwithſtanding others do gainſay him, as in my ſlender reading I have obſerved of* Amyraldus *and Mr* Truman;) *nevertheleſs all of them do agree in this, That* Deus propter hoc vult hoc eſſe, *which indeed is a truth beyond all contradiction. And as it is the very letter of Scripture, that God chooſeth ſinners to ſalvation through ſanctification and belief of the truth,* 2 Theſ. 2. 13. (*and therefore, as I am apt to think, not without reſpect thereunto*) *ſo I am moſt aſſured that it is the very truth of Scripture, that God puts no ſinner (elect, or not elect to ſalvation, I ſay thus, becauſe there are many great Divines, who with* Auſtin *hold, that all who are ſanctified are not of the elect number*) *into an eſtate*

of

of life, or justifies them without respect to their faith, which worketh by love. I may justly stile this Authors Divinity concerning the irrespective election and irrespective justification of sinners (to speak in his own language) prodigious Divinity, a prodigy of Divinity; for I think, that in the Native consequence thereof it makes (with due reverence to the Divine Majesty be it spoken) a Prodigy of God himself, by turning The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ into the similitude of a Creature worse than what is said was done by the Israelites *in the Wilderness (*Psal. 106. 20. *into the similitude of an Ox, that eateth grass) even into the similitude of such a creature as I abhor to think upon, and shall therefore here forbear to name. But the best of it is, that there is (to my seeming) no more agreement with this Authors divinity in this page with his divinity in another before recited (he there saying,* That God doth not save sinners meerly arbitrarily and for no reason*) than between light and darkness, or between Christ and Belial. I proceed to specifie this Authors Doctrine touching the Article of redemption by Christ.*

3. *In page* 76. He condemns the asserting, that Christ died for all men as Popish Doctrine, and says of us, In like manner do our late Authors lay this as a foundation, that Christ died for all men properly and intentionally. *What*

What this Author calls Popiſh, is, as I am perſwaded, truly Proteſtant and Scriptural Doctrine. What he means by (Properly) I know not, But certain I am, that however in a peculiar ſenſe, or for a more peculiar reaſon Chriſt is ſaid in certain Scriptures to die for ſome (his ſheep, his Church;) nevertheleſs in other Scriptures he is ſaid to die for All and every man, 2 Cor. 5. 14. Heb. 2. 9. *And if he did at all die for them, we may well lay it as a ſure foundation, that he died for them intentionally, or intended to die for them, whereupon it may be truly ſaid, That in his dying for ſinners he did not onely pay a price ſufficient for all, but alſo, He paid for all a ſufficient price, and upon that account he is to be acknowledged the Redeemer of all Mankind. And however* Ameſius, *with certain of the Synodiſts at* Dort (*the Low* Dutch *Divines*) *have denied it, yet this Author, I preſume, is not ignorant, that our* Britiſh *Divines with thoſe of* Breme, (*to name no more*) *were otherwiſe minded, and touching the Doctrine of Univerſal Redemption in a Scriptural ſenſe, he may be pleaſed to peruſe at leiſure our famous* Davenant, De morte Chriſti, *and* Dallies Apology againſt Spanhemius his Exercitations. *I proceed to mention this Authors Doctrines concerning other matters of our Chriſtian Faith,* viz. *Forgiveneſs of Sin, Juſtification, Repentance, Juſtifying Faith.*

4. If

4. If Juſtification, *ſays he, p.* 110. be real forgiveneſs of ſin, it cannot depend upon works.

That Juſtification is real forgiveneſs of ſin is indeed true Proteſtant Doctrine, & Habemus Authorem ipſum confitentem, *this Author himſelf doth acknowledge it* (*as appears by ſeveral teſtimonies out of his book before recited*) *but to deny juſtification to depend upon works and therefore to deny it, becauſe juſtification is real forgiveneſs of ſin, is not Proteſtant, or Scripture Doctrine. I may well here apply the old ſaying*, Cujus contrarium verum eſt: *for becauſe Goſpel-juſtification is real forgiveneſs of ſin, therefore or thereupon it is moſt apparent by the Scriptures, that it doth depend upon works, for proof whereof I ſhall onely quote two Texts or verſes in one Chapter*, 1 John 1. 7, 9. *And having mentioned theſe texts of Scripture, I ſhall recite his inferences from the Doctrine of his Brethren, which he oppoſeth, and leave it to the judgment of the learned Reader, Whether he had not a like reaſon to infer, or object the ſame againſt the Doctrine of the Apoſtle S.* John *in the forecited Scriptures, as againſt theirs.*

In p. 188. *he ſays*, That upon our aſſerting the immediate effect of Chriſts righteouſneſs to be the procuring a new grant, or charter of life upon condition of ſincere obedience to God and Chriſt, That thus Chriſt

is

is but a remote Saviour, His righteouſneſs juſtifies not at all, onely makes way, that our own may juſtifie us, We are not waſhed from our ſins in his blood, but by our own repentance and obedience; onely his blood procured, that our obedience might be a means of our expiation; We are beholding to Chriſt for making a way for our juſtification, but we muſt be juſtified by our own ſelves, our righteouſneſs being the onely immediate and totall cauſe of our juſtification. *Thus he. Now judge, Chriſtian Reader, Whether this Author had not a like reaſon to make the ſame inferences from the Apoſtolical Doctrine of S.* John, *as againſt ours touching forgiveneſs of ſin its depending upon works, and to ſay. If we muſt walk in the light as God is in the light, that thereupon we may be cleanſed by the blood of his ſon from all ſin, If we muſt confeſs our ſins (yea and forſake them ſays* Solomon, *Prov.* 28. 13.) *that thereupon we may be forgiven and cleanſed from all unrighteouſneſs, Thus is Chriſt but a remote Saviour, His righteouſneſs juſtifies not at all, onely makes way----We are not waſhed from our ſins in his blood, but by our own repentance and obedient walking, Onely his blood procured, that---- We are beholding to Chriſt for making a way----but we muſt be juſtified by our own ſelves, our righteouſneſs (our obediential walking and penitential confeſſing of our ſins)*

ſins) *muſt be the immediate total cauſe of our juſtification. Thus by confuting us, he hath killed two birds with one ſtone (I mean) he hath confuted the Evangeliſt and Apoſtle S.* John *alſo.*

5. *He ſays, p.* 120. That Jeſus Chriſt having performed the conditions of life, the conditions of the covenant are not to be performed by us, *i. e.* by the Head and Members both.

This his Doctrine I take to be Doctrine Anti-proteſtant: for therein is implyed this piece of falſe Doctrine, viz. *That Chriſt is the onely perſon covenanted with by God and that it is the ſame covenant and law, which is made with and for Chriſt, and which is made with and for us.*

6. *He ſays, p.* 72. That our Doctrine of conditional Juſtification is no leſs in ſubſtance, than the Popiſh juſtification by works, though put into more Scriptural phraſes. *And he ſays, p.* 87. That the Popiſh Doctrine, that Chriſt hath merited, that our works ſhould deſerve heaven, is in other terms no more than that Chriſt hath purchaſed, that our works ſhould be the condition, whereupon we ſhall be ſaved.

If this be true, that the Papiſts mean no more by the merits of their works, than is here ſaid; ſurely we have all cauſe to bleſs God for it, and not to oppoſe them in it, but

to ſay to them according to the old ſaying, Mentem teneas, *however there be juſt occaſion to ſay to them,* Linguam corrigas: *for their ſaid meaning is the very ſenſe of Scripture, even of the Prophets of God and Apoſtles of Jeſus Chriſt,* 1 Joh. 1.7. 1 Cor. 15. 2. 1 Tim. 2. 1. Col. 1. 23. Amos 5. 14.

7. *In p.* 84, *he ſays,* That as our ſaid Doctrine of conditional juſtification, and that of the Papiſts agree in the article of juſtification ſo they do alſo about juſtifying faith; The Papiſts deny it to be a truſt, or affiance in the promiſes of ſalvation, *Conc. Trid. Seſſ 6. can.* 12. Si quis dixerit, fidem juſtificantem nihil aliud eſſe quam fiduciam divinæ miſericordiæ peccata propter Chriſtum, vel eam fiduciam ſolam eſſe, qua juſtificamur, Anathema ſit. This alſo is the Doctrine of our Authors, and indeed if we are not juſtified immediately by the righteouſneſs of Chriſt without the intervention of our obedience, then to truſt in his righteouſneſs cannot juſtifie us, ſays he.

It is the truly ancient, Catholick and Apoſtolical Doctrine, as well as the Doctrine of Mr Throughtons *Authors, that we are not juſtified meerly by this one act of faith (truſting in Chriſts righteouſneſs) but by the intervention of other acts thereof alſo,* viz. *by faith its acting it ſelf by repentance, holy deſires and purpoſes*----

3. For-

2. *Forasmuch as Christs righteousness is one thing, and trust in his righteousness is another, the things he implicitly here affirms, are inconsistent,* viz. *That we are justified immediately by Christs righteousness, and yet not without, but by the intervention of our trust in it.*

3. *He wrongs the Papists in saying, that they deny justifying faith to be a trust, or affiance in the promises of salvation; the thing by them denied being onely this,* viz. *That justifying faith is not a meer trust in the promise of salvation, as the* Trent *Canon here recited doth plainly manifest.*

4. *This Author had no more reason to distaste, or gainsay this* Tridentine *Canon, nor yet that recited by him in these words, p.* 76. (Si quis dixerit, homines justificari vel solâ imputatione justitiæ Christi, vel solâ peccatorum remissione, exclusâ gratiâ, & charitate, quæ in cordibus eorum per spiritum sanctum diffundatur, atq; illis inhæreat, aut etiam gratiam, quâ justificamur esse tantum favorem dei, Anathema sit) *than there is cause for him, or me to deny Jesus Christ to be the son of God, because the Devils did confess it,* Mar. 1. 24. *Hath this Author indeed* αἰσθητήρια γεγυμνασμένα, *senses so exercised, as to discern good and evil, or to distinguish betwixt truly Protestant and Popish Doctrine?*

8. He says, p. 196. That men in their sinful and lost estate are not capable of new

 condi-

tions of life, being under the ſentence of wrath for breaking the law; therefore not to be treated with by God upon new terms, or conditions, being alſo utterly unable in this eſtate to fulfill any new conditions.

This I take to be no Proteſtant, or Scriptural Doctrine: for I have always thought and am ſtill of the ſame mind, That the external way, in, or by which God doth treat with ſinners, is by the diſpenſation of his word and Goſpel (wherein are contained precepts, promiſes and threatnings) and which Goſpel by Gods command is to be preached to every rational creature; ſo that this Authors Doctrine doth give a Superſedeas, *or check to the execution of that Commiſſion of our Saviour given to his Apoſtles for their treating with all and every ſinner, declaring to them the terms or conditions of their ſalvation through Chriſt revealed, and beſeeching them as his Ambaſſadors, and in his ſtead, to accept of them, that thereupon they may for Chriſts ſake be made partakers of the ſalvation promiſed in the Goſpel. Nor do I perceive any more reaſon, why mens inability (of themſelves) to fulfill the new conditions of the covenant, ſhould more make againſt inſtitution of ſuch conditions, and render them uncaple to be treated with by God in that way, than their ſaid inability doth render them uncapable of Gods giving, or their receiving any ſuch commands from God as that in* Ezek. 18. lat.

18. lat. Make you a new heart and a new ſpirit, *together with many other Scriptures of the ſame importance both in the Old and New Teſtament.*

9. Though he doth frequently acknowledg juſtification to be all one with remiſſion of ſin, yet he denies that ſo much as a purpoſe of new obedience is antecedent thereunto, making the contrary to be Popiſh Doctrine, *p.* 79. and hardning himſelf with the authority of Dr *Preſton*, he ſaying on *Eph.* 2. 3. That juſtification hath no antecedent conditions, though it hath conditions, that follow it.

This Doctrine hath been already manifeſted to be anti evangelical Doctrine, nor is it any whit the more authentick for being atteſted by any humane authority (the miſtake of Dr. Preſton *therein I have long ſince taken notice of, and refuted his reaſonings at large in other papers) the contrary being that indeed, wherein both Proteſtants and Papiſts do and ſhould agree, no pardon being by God ſo much as promiſed to ſinners but upon the condition of a ſincere purpoſe of amendment as antecedaneous to the enjoyment thereof, the conditions, which follow it being conditions not of the thing it ſelf, or thing it ſelf ſimply to be enjoyed, but of the enjoyment thereof to be continued or not loſt.*

10. He ſays, *p.* 49. That faith is a coming empty and naked of all righteouſneſs of our own, that we may be accepted only through Chriſt.

This alſo I conceive to be no part of the Proteſtant Doctrine of juſtification by faith onely, their Doctrine being this, viz. *That juſtifying faith is an operative faith, which works by love, and therefore cannot be a coming to God empty and naked of all righteouſneſs of our own (with which kind of faith thoſe, who came unto him, were not welcomed by him, but turned from him without their errand,* Mat. 7. 21, 22, 23.) *but it is a coming to God in the name of Chriſt with ſuch repentance, ſelf loathing and ſupplications as did the Publican, ſaying,* (God be mercifull to me a ſinner) *with a willingneſs to be rid of the ſervice of ſin, and to take upon them Chriſts eaſie yoak, that through this way of well-doing they may for the ſake of Jeſus Chriſt the Righteous be accepted with God; this kind of well-doing being the condition, upon which ſinners are (according to the tenour of Gods promiſes) to expect acceptance with God and not otherwiſe,* Gen. 4. 8. 2 Cor. 6. lat.

11. In p. 122. He denies faith to be a condition of pardon, and gives this reaſon, ſaying, Faith is nothing elſe but truſting in mercy and free grace with acknowledgment of ſin and miſery, and therefore it is of all things moſt unfit to be a condition of pardon, being no ſervice to God, nor bringing any proper tribute of honour to him, but what is founded upon his own good pleaſure to forgive.

This

This is no Proteſtant Doctrine, that juſtifying faith (for of this faith he ſpake thoſe words) is nothing elſe but truſting in mercy and free grace with an acknowledgment of ſin and miſery (as hath been already manifeſted in the foregoing paragraph).

2. *That faith, which the Author here will own to be juſtifying faith, or the means, or way to juſtification (as are his expreſſions elſe where) the Proteſtants do with the Scripiures diſown to be juſtifying faith,* (viz. *ſuch a faith as is nothing elſe, but truſting in mercy and free grace with an acknowledgment of ſin and miſery) they reputing faith without works to be a dead faith.*

3. *It is admirable to me that this Author ſhould upon the reaſon, or reaſons here ſpecified deny the faith here deſcribed by him to be a condition of pardon, or juſtification, and yet aſſert it to be an effectual way and means to it, as he doth elſewhere in his book.*

13. A ſinner, ſays he p. 127. by flying to, or truſting in Chriſt for reconciliation is juſtified before God (in nature at leaſt) before he conſidereth Chriſt as a King, or Prophet. And ſays he p 128.) Faith in order of nature (and of time in ſome) firſt looketh upon Chriſt as a Prieſt for reconciliation with God, then as a Prophet and King for illumination and ſanctification.

The contrary doctrine I take to be the true

Proteſtant doctrine, viz.

1. *That it not ſaving faith till it look upon Chriſt as Chriſt*, i. e. *upon Chriſt in all his ſaving offices.*

2. *That though a ſinner ſhould firſt look upon Chriſt as a Prieſt for reconciliation with God, yet that he is not meerly thereupon juſtified at all (whether in time, or in nature) before he conſidereth, yea and accepteth Chriſt as a King and Prophet. I am perſwaded, that though a ſinner ſhould look upon Chriſt as a Prieſt for reconciliation, he may look out his eyes and not be reconciled to God meerly upon ſuch a look or looking, nor till he both look upon him, and accept him as a King and Prophet. And whereas this Author ſays (ibid.)* That Chriſt in the order of his offices was firſt a Prieſt undertaking to ſatisfie for ſin, then a Prophet and King to rule and guide his people to eternal life, *I anſwer, Neither do I believe this to be any branch of Proteſtant doctrine of juſtification by faith onely, but rather the contrary, viz. That Chriſt was at once conſtituted, the Chriſt of God, or our Mediator in all his Offices; nor do I believe, that if it had been even thus, as this Author hath modelled the matter in his own fancy, it would prove the thing intended thereby*, viz. *That a ſinner is juſtified before God before he conſidereth Chriſt as a King, or Prophet.*

14. Though he acknowledgeth, *p.* 164. that

that a working faith, or a faith apt to produce obedience is the only juſtifying faith, nevertheleſs he denies, that the operativeneſs of it hath any proper influence upon juſtification, only it muſt be a working faith for other reaſons.

Anſw. 1. *Neither is this any branch of the Proteſtant, or Scripture-Doctrine to deny the operativeneſs of faith to be any part of the condition, or means of juſtification: for as for the words (influence and proper influence) we do decline ſuch expreſſions, having never aſſerted, that either faith, or the operativeneſs thereof have any proper influence upon juſtification.*

2. *Yea the contrary I judge to be the true Proteſtant Doctrine*, viz. *That the mode, or qualification of faith, that it be a working faith, for its aptitude to produce good works, is as well appointed by God to be the means, or condition, by, or upon which a ſinner is to be juſtified, as is faith it ſelf, or that in its kind it be true faith. If one promiſe to give to his neighbour a reward, if he will bring him an horſe of ſuch, or ſuch a colour, it is part of the condition, that it be of the colour nominated and agreed upon betwixt them, as that it be an horſe.*

15. *Davids* repentance (*ſays he, p.* 175.) was neceſſary only to remove Gods fatherly diſpleaſure for the preſent, but not to averr, or prevent his eternal damnation (as he plainly there inſinuates.) *This*

This is not Proteſtant Doctrine, that a godly man having committed ſuch heinous crimes, as Davids (*Murder and Adultery*) *is not obliged to repent for them under peril of damnation. And I am apt to think, that the* Dort-*Synodiſts did not abet ſuch Doctrine. Sure I am, that our* Britiſh *Divines do renounce it, they roundly averring, That if* David *had not repented he had been damned, he by thoſe his enormous crimes having loſt his right* (*by them ſtyled* Jus aptitudinale) *to the kingdom of heaven.*

16. Repentance properly taken (*ſays he, p.* 176.) is required in Scripture ſometimes as neceſſary to ſalvation, ſometimes to pardon, but conſequently, not antecedently, as a diſpoſition, that muſt be in a ſubject, that is pardoned, not as the very means of obtaining pardon.

Neither is this Proteſtant Doctrine, it being apparently contrary to the Scriptures both of the Old and New Teſtament, as hath been already proved and proveable by Act. 2. 38. *and* 3. 19. *repentance being there required in order to pardon, the force of which Scriptures he pretends to evade by this bold and ſhameful anſwer, ſaying, p.* 175, 176. That by repentance there is meant an external repentace, which is neceſſary to an external and temporary pardon, which may be without that inward true repentance, which is pleaded to be the con-

condition of juſtification, or pardon of ſin. *With the like ſhamefull confidence doth he put off that Scripture, in* Mat. 6. 14, 15. *ſaying, p.* 179. It doth not prove that our forgiving others is a condition of Gods forgiving us, *ſaying moreover*, That that Scripture with others there mentioned (*Eph.* 4. 32. *Mat.* 18. 23, 24, 32, 33.) ſpeak more properly of external pardon, not of juſtification to eternal life. *But what if it ſhould be granted, that they ſpeak moſt properly of external pardon? will any Proteſtant conclude from thence, that they ſpeak it excluſively to eternal forgiveneſs, as he interpreted* Act. 2. 38. *and* 3. 19?

17. Juſtification by works, *ſays he, p.* 197. in any ſenſe will not exclude boaſting: for a man may ſay, He hath done thoſe things, upon which juſtification is promiſed, and therefore it is his due to be juſtified. Juſtification by faith excludes boaſting, only when men acknowledge, they are nothing and can do nothing, but truſt to receive all of free grace.

Quicquid bonorum operum habemus, id eſt fructus regenerationis. Unde ſequitur, opera ipſa eſſe partem gratiæ, quibus ideo ſalutem non poſſumus mereri, *Calv.* on *Eph.* 2. 10.

Mr Calvin *doubtleſs would diſown this as any part of Proteſtant Doctrine*, viz. *That the aſſerting of any works in any ſenſe*, i. e. *faithful works, or works of faith to be any part of the condition of pardon, or juſtification, will not exclude boaſting: for himſelf aſſerts* (upon Eph. 2. 10.) *that our evangelical works are* Pars gratiæ, *and conſequently do as much exclude boaſt-*

boasting as doth faith it self, it being God, who worketh in us both to will and to do of his good pleasure. Hereupon although in one sense believers must say with S. Paul (*they are nothing,* 2 Cor. 12. 11.) *yet may they say with the same Apostle elsewhere, I can do all things through Christ, that strengthneth me,* Phil. 4. 13.

2. *Justification would be as much a sinners due upon this Authors supposal, that a bare trust in Gods promise were the only means of divine appointment for the attaining of it, as it would upon the supposal of the truth of our doctrine concerning the necessity of repentance also by vertue of Gods command in order thereunto, and upon the former supposal as well as the latter, a man may say, He hath done that upon which justification is promised, and therefore it is his due to be justified.*

18. Having said in *p.* 199. That faith justifieth the ungodly, not the obedient, he says in *p.* 95. That *Abraham* was justified as an ungodly man by imputed righteousness.

Doubtless this is no Protestant Doctrine: for although time was, when Abraham *was ungodly and then not justified, nevertheless when after justified, he in person was not an ungodly man, nor was he justified as an ungodly man, but as a pious and an obedient believer.*

19. He denies the Gospel to be a new law, and God a Lawgiver in granting terms of salvation,

vation, *p.* 51. and 112. The aſſerting whereof he cenſures to be Popiſh and Socinian Doctrine, allowing the Goſpel, or covenant of grace properly taken to be only a promiſe of grace and life through Chriſt to loſt ſinners, *p.* 110.

The contrary doctrine I have always conceived to be the true Proteſtant and Scriptural Doctrine, the Goſpel of Chriſt being in expreſs letters ſtyled a law both in the Old and New Teſtament. What is or can be meant by the Apoſtles expreſſions (The Law of Faith and the Law of Chriſt, Rom. 3. 27. Gal. 6. 2.) *but the Goſpel of Chriſt? And what is meant by thoſe expreſſions of the Prophets* (Iſa. 2. begin. *and* Mic. 4. 21. Out of *Zion* ſhall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from *Jeruſalem*) *but the promulgation of the Goſpel as a law to be begun firſt at* Jeruſalem *and thence to be publiſhed throughout all nations, of whom it was foretold,* Iſa. 42. 4. *That the Iſles, that is, the Gentiles ſhould wait for this law of Jeſus Chriſt, ſtyled His law?*

20. Our juſtification and ſalvation (*ſays he, p.* 105. were typified and ſet out by the birth of *Iſaac, Rom.* 4. 18. By the deliverance out of *Egypt* and *Babylon*-----but in all theſe there was nothing of mans work, or endeavour----from whence we argue, that no works of ours have any concurrence in bringing us out of the ſtate of death into the eſtate of life by Chriſt.

If

If the Gospel of Christ be no law, but a meer promise, well might this Author conclude, that there is no duty therein commanded, or imposed upon sinners, whereby through Gods assisting grace to extricate themselves out of the estate of death, and that no work of ours (so much as our own endeavours) have, or are to have any concurrence therein. The contrary doctrine I believe to be Protestant doctrine and the truth of Scripture, wherein sinners are commanded to co-operate with God, To circumcise the foreskin of their hearts, Deut. 10. 18. *To circumcise themselves to the Lord,* Jer. 4. 4. *To make them new hearts and new spirits,* Ezek. 18. lat. *To make themselves clean,* Isa. 1. 16. *To hear, that their souls may live,* Isa. 55. 3. *Not to grieve, resist, or quench the spirit,* 1 Thes. 5. 19. *Briefly, To awake and stand up from the dead, this being the way in which Christ doth give us life,* Eph. 5. 14.

2. *Nor do I believe what this Author hath here said, either that the manner of Gods justifying and saving sinners without any concurrence of their own works, or workings was typified by the birth of* Isaac, *and by the deliverance out of* Egypt, *or* Babylon, *or that no works of* Abraham, *or the* Israelites *did concur to the effecting or actual bringing to pass of Gods promises to them, I say, I can no more believe our Author herein, than I can perswade my self either that* Abraham *did not beget* Isaac

(*for*

(*for as it is recorded, that* Sarah *conceived him*, Gen. 21. 2. *So it is as expreſſy ſaid, that* Abraham *begat him*, Mat. 1. 2. (*or that the* Iſraelites *were brought out of* Egypt *and* Babylon *without their own conſent, or the uſe of their legs; though withall I do not forget what is ſaid concerning Gods bringing his people out of* Egypt, *How that he did it with a mighty hand and a ſtretched forth arm, Yea that he bare them on Eagles wings, and brought them unto himſelf*, Exod. 19. 4.

21. *He ſays p.* 111. That to impoſe new conditions of obedience is a new covenant of works with ſome mercy, but no covenant of grace.

The true Proteſtant Doctrine is, that the new covenant truly is a covenant of grace, notwithſtanding that obedience, which is therein commanded as the condition of enjoying pardon and ſalvation therein promiſed. God promiſeth to his revolted Iſrael *to love them freely, Hoſ.* 14. 4. *Yet not otherwiſe than upon their faithful and penetential return to him commanded, ver.* 1. 2. *This Author doth indeed copiouſly ſet himſelf to prove, that to juſtifie by pardon of ſin and free grace and to juſtifie by works in any ſenſe*, i. e. *to make any kind of works any part of the condition of juſtification, or remiſſion of ſin, are inconſiſtent, arguing from* Rom. 11. 6. *the utter inconſiſtency of all manner of works with divine*

grace,

grace, which conſtruction of his as it is a-gainſt plain reaſon, ſo it is as palpably againſt the analogy of faith, I mean the current of many other Scriptures: for if grace and all manner of works in any ſenſe be utterly oppoſite and inconſiſtent, it would be impoſſible, for any promiſe to be a gracious promiſe that hath any duty therein impoſed as the condition of enjoying the benefit promiſed, which to affirm is point blank contrary to that Scripture, 1 Chr. 30. 9. (*The Lord our God is gracious and merciful and will not turn away his face from you, ſays* Hezekiah, *If Ye return unto Him,) and very many others, particularly* Jer. 3.1,12, Jon. 4.2. Joel 2. 12,13.

22. He concludes his arguing againſt us, from the example of *Abrahams* juſtification, and ſays *p.* 220. That works of no ſort, in no ſenſe did juſtifie *Abraham.*

This doubtleſs can be no part of the Proteſtant Doctrine touching juſtification; for they own the Epiſtle of S. James *for a part of Canonical Scripture (although* Lutherus vivus *did not) wherein it being aſſerted, That* Abraham *was juſtified by works and not by faith onely, the Proteſtants as well as Papiſts, do conclude, That certainly* Abraham *was juſtified by ſome ſort of works in ſome ſenſe, or elſe St.* James *was miſtaken.*

23. He reproves us for our concurring with the Papiſts, *p.* 85. in deſcribing faith to be ſuch an aſſent to all the truths of the Goſpel

pel, as makes a man love, fear, ſerve God, forgive his enemies----and that we are juſtified as well by believing the threatnings and the commands and hiſtories, as by believing the promiſes.

1. *It is a great ſcandal to Proteſtancy for any profeſſed Proteſtant to gainſay any Papiſt for ſuch a deſcription of juſtifying faith as is here recited, or to deny, that we are juſtified as well by believing divine threatnings as well as promiſes.*

2. *Foraſmuch as very much of the Goſpel of Chriſt is Hiſtorical, we cannot be juſtified, or ſaid to be juſtified by believing the Goſpel, but by believing hiſtory. Yea S.* Paul *doubted not to ſay, that we are juſtified and ſaved by our profeſſed belief of the hiſtory of Chriſts reſurrection,* Rom. 10. 9, 10.

3. *Foraſmuch as Gods promiſes of pardon and ſalvation to ſinners through Chriſt are conditional, and foraſmuch as all conditional promiſes are vertually threatnings (even as all conditional threatnings are vertual promiſes) ſinners cannot believe the one without an implicite faith of the other, for believing the one, they do of natural neceſſity believe the other.*

24. *He blames us, p.* 191. *for concurring with Socinas, in ſaying,* Idem eſt Chriſto credere ac Chriſto obedire.

For my own part I verily thought this ſaying (though in the mouth of a Devil) had been true

Proteſtant Doctrine, and that therein we do concur with the Apoſtle S. Paul, *who doth as plainly, as almoſt the pen of man can expreſs, make* Credere Evangelio & obedire Evangelio, *to believe the Goſpel and obey the Goſpel (not to inſiſt alſo upon the word in the original its ſignifying both to believe and to obey, and is therefore by our Tranſlators rendred indifferently, ſometimes to believe and ſometimes to obey.) I ſay, the Apoſtle makes theſe two to be all one.*

I might produce very many other inſtances, whereby to manifeſt what real diſſervice this Author by his book throughout hath done to the Proteſtant cauſe (his contrary pretenſes notwithſtanding) to the ſcandalizing of the Proteſtant Churches, and to the hardning of our common Adverſaries both Papiſts and Socinians) in their enmity againſt our truly Proteſtant Doctrine. And it grieves me not a little, that I cannot do that ſervice to God, his truth and the Proteſtant Church, (whereof I am both a Member and a Miniſter) as I think my ſelf obliged Pro poſſe meo *to endeavour, without expoſing the nakedneſs of this brother and of all thoſe Brethren (which as I hear, are not a few) who do applaud his book and abet him in his Anti-proteſtant and Anti-evangelical miſtakes, and in ſuch a matter as himſelf in the firſt page of his Epiſtle to the Reader doth aver to be the chief and weightieſt point in practical*

tical Divinity. But haſtning towards the concluſion of this Prefatory Epiſtle, I ſhall forbear to ſpecifie any other inſtances of like import with thoſe already produced, onely requeſting the Reader as to obſerve, ſo alſo to bear in mind, That the great thing, which this Author contends for by this his book is to maintain the new Covenant to be unconditional, not allowing faith it ſelf to be therein impoſed by God upon ſinners as any condition of enjoying the benefits promiſed in the ſaid covenant, viz. *Juſtification, remiſſion, and ſalvation) and diſallowing alſo the imputation of faith it ſelf for righteouſneſs, the contrary doctrine of his Brethren in theſe points being ſo offenſive and diſtaſtful to him, as that (among other his falſhoods and ſlanderous words in his Epiſtle to the Reader, he ſays, That we do in effect tell the people, that the Papiſts are in the right in all the main Doctrines our Reformers oppoſe them in.*

I was about immediately ultimam manum apponere, *to conclude. But becauſe I perceive this Author is ſo ſcrupulous and fearful to aſſert, that ought in, or done, or to be done by ſinners is any condition of their pardon of ſin, or juſtification through Chriſt (although the conditional particle If, as expreſſive of the nature, or intereſt of a Condition, as the tongue of men, or Angels can utter, be never ſo frequently uſed in Scripture) it may not therefore be amiſs to*

take notice of the reaſon or reaſons of that his ſcruple, which being expreſſed by him in page 134. *I will recite, and in few words reply to.*

Becauſe the term of condition doth properly imply a full power in man to fulfill it, if he will take pains to fulfill it, and eſpecially becauſe it ſeemeth to make God depend upon man in the performance of his own purpoſes and promiſes, I ſhould chooſe rather to ſay, Good works and obedience are the way and order, in which onely God giveth more grace and glory and every good thing, *Pſal.* 84. 11 than to ſay, They are conditions of ſalvation.

Anſw. *And is this indeed the true reaſon, and all the reaſon? It being all to a tittle, which I find here expreſſed by this Author, I reply,*

1. *The term* condition *doth properly imply no more power, or other power in man to fulfill it, than Gods bare commanding us any Chriſtian ſaving duty doth imply a power in man to fulfill that ſimple command.*

2. *As Gods bare commanding man to do this, or that duty doth imply a power in man (though not meerly of himſelf, yet through Gods aſſiſting help and mans co-operating with God, or his taking pains (as is this Authors phraſe) to perform that command, ſo doth Gods impo-*

ſing

ſing that duty as a condition of his promiſed mercy imply the ſame power in man ſo aſſiſted and ſo co-operating, to fulfill the condition (for if man ſo aſſiſted and co operating had not a power ſo to do, well might we ſay with the Diſciples, Who then can be ſaved?) ſo that the word condition is as properly uſed in this caſe, as the word command, the thing required of man being as properly a condition as Gods bare requiring of a thing is properly a command to do it.

Let theſe replies be the rather obſerved, becauſe they may ſerve to anſwer what we read, page 40. *Where having ſaid, that this is the Core of our opinion, that it turneth the Goſpel into a Covenant of works, and thereby leſſeneth, if not maketh void, the righteouſneſs of Chriſt in the efficacy of it for our redemption, he proceeds to ſay,*

To what purpoſe is it to promiſe life upon condition of obedience be it never ſo ſo eaſie, when it is known, that a man had no power to do any thing, that ſhould be required, before the covenant was made?

Obſerve, Reader, That what is here ſaid doth as well, yea as much militate, or make againſt Gods bare commanding man in his lapſed eſtate any duty, as againſt Gods im-

poſing the performance of that duty as the condition of his ſalvation, foraſmuch as mans whether power, or impotency to perform a duty barely commanded, or impoſed as a condition by God, is the ſame in both caſes. I proceed in my reply, ſaying in the third place.

3. *The ſame reaſons, upon which this Author is ſo tender and timorous (that I may not ſay alſo ſuperſtitious) to uſe the term Condition, he might and ought (ſo far as I know) to have ſcrupled the uſe of the terms, way, order, or means (which laſt word in other places of his book he uſeth paſſim) for* 1. *Man by nature is* ἄτακτος, *a creature much diſordered, and there is as much power remaining in him to do the one as the other. Hath not man as much power to fulfill a condition of divine appointment for ſalvation, as to obſerve that order, which God hath preſcribed, or to make uſe of thoſe means, which God hath commanded, or to betake himſelf to that way of ſalvation, which God hath inſtituted? Doth not the Prophet ſay of the way of man as much as this Author can ſay of any duty impoſed by God as a condition,* viz. *That the way of man is not in himſelf (I know it, ſays the Prophet,* Jer. 10. 23.) It is not in man that walketh to direct his ſteps.

4. *How*

4. *How doth the word (Condition) make, or ſeem to make God to depend upon man in the performance of his purpoſes and promiſes more than the terms (preſcribed Order, Way, or means?) Not one jot the more to my ſimple underſtanding, or ſeeming; Onely man in both doth and may be truly ſaid to depend and to be obliged to depend upon God and his appointment, whereas the Independent God cannot truly be ſaid to depend upon any thing, although withall it may be truly ſaid (as was afore ſaid) that* Deus vult hoc eſſe propter hoc, *and that he hath other reaſons of his doing this, or that, ſpecially of beſtowing benefits (the benefits of pardon, juſtification and ſalvation) than his own arbitrary will, or meerly arbitrarily, as was this Authors fore-recited words; this therefore is a truth, which he is obliged not to gainſay under the peril of ſelf-contradiction.*

I will conclude my Reply to this Author with the ſame Scripture-words, as he doth his Book, ſaying in Gods name with the Prophet Jeremiah, (Chapter 6. verſe 16.) Stand ye in the ways and ſee and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye ſhall find reſt for your ſouls,

But withall let me expound the Prophets meaning; for he doth not mean, as this Author by comparing theſe laſt words of his Book ſeems to intend. viz. *Look to* Luther (*the Book it ſelf being entituled,* LUTHERUS REDIVIVUS) *but he meaneth as doth the Prophet* Iſaiah, *Chapter* 8. *verſe* 23. To the law and to the Teſtament. *This then is it, which I am minded to ſay, Look beyond* Luther, *look beyond the times, when there were any ſuch diſtinguiſhing names as Proteſtants, or Papiſts in the world.*

Briefly, let me ſpeak my mind, in two words, they being the words of our Saviour, John 5. 39. Search the Scriptures, *and take heed of being miſled by the names of ſuch men of renown, as were either* Luther *or* Calvin, *or any ſingle perſon among our famous Proteſtant Reformers, of whom notwithſtanding we may ſay as* Solomon *ſays concerning the juſt indefinitly,* Prov. 10. 7. *And* Eccleſiaſticus *concerning* Moſes *particularly* [Their memorial is bleſſed, *Chapter* 45. *verſe* 1.] *and for whom let us throughout all the Proteſtant Churches not onely give thanks to God, but pray alſo for them in the words of the laſt forecited Author, ſaying,* Let their memorial be bleſſed, and let their bones flouriſh out of

their

their place (*I mean out of their graves to their fulneſs of bliſs with all the Saints departed at the Reſurrection in the laſt day*) *Chapter* 49. 10. *But becauſe both* Luther *and* Calvin *with the beſt of our worthies were men ſubject to the like paſſions of heart and miſtakes of mind as we are, I ſhall ſay again,* To the law and to the Teſtimony; *to prevent the hurt, which the ſpecious title of this Authors Book may do to the unwary and unlearned Readers; for had not the title* (LUTHERUS REDIVIVUS) *been intended by him as a Lure or Bait to draw the more ſimple ſort to partake of his ſweet-meats, he would have choſen rather* (*I doubt not*) *to have entituled it* CRISPUS REDIVIVUS. *Theſe words I would not have ſpoken, if the cauſe of ſaying them could poſſibly have been hid.*

I conclude with the words of the Apoſtle, Prove all things: hold faſt that which is good, 1 Theſ. 5. 21. (*that which is good and true in any whether* Arminian, Socinian, Proteſtant, *or* Popiſh *Writer*) *to which counſel of the Apoſtle, I ſhall onely add that of our Saviour,* John 7. 24. Judge not according to appearance, but judge righteous

teous judgment. *This is the humble request of,*

Reader, Thy aged servant in the Ministry of the Gospel.

Stanton. Feb. 5. 167$\frac{7}{8}$.

Thomas Hotchkis.

The

THE

Contents.

Chap. I.

Q. *Is there any kind of Righteouſneſs expreſly ſaid in Scripture to be imputed to Believers?* Anſw. *Yes, proved by* Rom. 4. 6. *from which text together with the context it is alſo manifeſted, That forgiveneſs of ſin is that righteouſneſs, which for Chriſts ſake is there ſaid to be imputed to them. A diſtinction concerning a twofold Non-imputation of ſin commended to obſervation. The matter cleared from an Objection, with the Atteſtation of ſeveral worthy Authors,* p. 1.

CHAP. II.

Q. *What manner of Righteouſneſs is forgiveneſs*

neſs of ſin? Anſw. *In order to the reſolution of the Queſtion a diſtinction concerning a twofold Righteouſneſs is premiſed (the word* Righteouſneſs *implying ſometimes* Officium, *duty commanded; and ſometimes* Beneficium, *mercy promiſed:) which diſtinction being alſo in other words apt for edification expreſſed, the Queſtion it ſelf is thereupon plainly determined.* p. 12.

CHAP. III.

Q. *Why is Forgiveneſs of ſin in Scripture ſtyled Righteouſneſs, or a perſon pardoned there ſaid to be Righteous?* Anſw. *The Queſtion for the more clearneſs of underſtanding is anſwered both Negatively and Affirmatively. A Caution to prevent the miſconſtruction of ſome places in Scripture, and two Rules ſuggeſted as conducing to a right interpretation thereof. A few brief Animadverſions upon ſome paſſages in Mr.* Will. Bradſhawes *Latin Diſſertation concerning Juſtification.* p. 18.

CHAP. IV.

Q. *What peculiar Names have certain Modern Authors uſed to give to the ſaid imputed, or imparted Righteouſneſs (the Non-imputation of ſin) whereby to diſtinguiſh it from that other kind of Righteouſneſs, which doth conſiſt in a practical conformity to the law of God?* Anſw. *They have diſtinguiſhed them by ſuch Names, or Epithetes*

thetes as theſe, viz. *Active and Paſſive*; *Negative and Poſitive*; *Proper and Improper*; *Literal and Interpretative*; *Legal and Prolegal*; *to which is added, Primary and Secondary, with the Authors Opinion concerning the fitneſs of the ſaid diacritical, or diſtinguiſhing Titles.* P. 27

CHAP. V.

Q. *By what diſtinguiſhed words is the ſaid Imputed Righteouſneſs ſtyled in Scripture?* Anſw. *It is ſtyled a Righteouſneſs without works. Hereupon it being queſtioned, how, or in what ſenſe it is, or can be ſaid to be (foraſmuch as the expreſſion, a Righteouſneſs without Works, is in ſound like the expreſſion, a Righteouſneſs without Righteouſneſs) the Queſtion is anſwered more at large, 1. Negatively, 2. Affirmatively.* P. 32

CHAP. VI.

Another diſtinguiſhing Phraſe, whereby the ſaid imparted or imputed righteouſneſs (forgiveneſs of ſin) expreſſed in the Writings of S. Paul, is a righteouſneſs of God, and without the Law, the Reaſons whereof are ſpecified in the Chapters immediately following. P. 39

CHAP. VII.

Q. *Why is the ſaid imputed righteouſneſs ſtyled the Righteouſneſs of God? Anſwer Hereunto it is anſwered both Negatively and*

and Affirmatively, What it, and What is not, the Reason thereof. p. 41

CHAP. VIII.

Q. *What Law doth the Apostle mean in stiling pardon of sin a Righteousness without Law?* Answ. *In answer hereunto it is specified both what is and is not the reason thereof. A large explication of* Phil. 3. 9. *wherein is manifested what righteousness that is, which he calls his own, and yet doth disown: and a vindication of the said Scripture from the misconstruction of divers Brethren.* p. 43

CHAP. IX.

Further Reasons added to those in Chapter VII. Why the said Righteousness is styled the Righteousness of God: wherein it is commended to observation, that there is a twofold righteousness mentioned in Scripture, one which is so our own, as that it may and must be called the Righteousness of God; and another which is so our own, as that it may not, ought not, to be styled the Righteousness of God: and what these two kinds of Righteousness are, is plainly specified. Whence it is inferred, that Jesus Christ did not, in reference to the justification of a sinner, keep the Law in his stead. p. 52

CHAP. X.

Q. *Why is the said imparted or imputed righ-*

righteouſneſs of God ſtyled a righteouſneſs without the Law? Anſw. *The Queſtion is anſwered,* 1. *Negatively, What is not:* 2. *Affirmatively, What are the Reaſons thereof.* p. 57

CHAP. XI.

Another Scriptural Title given to remiſſion of ſin is, in its being ſtyled the righteouſneſs which is of, by, from, and through Faith; divers Reaſons whereof are rendred. The Authors Opinion touching the pardonableneſs of ſin, or placability of God in the queſtion, Whether, this was any part of the τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, i. e. *A thing diſcoverable by the light of Nature.* p. 62

CHAP. XII.

Q. *Whether doth a Sinner need ought more than the righteouſneſs of Chriſt to juſtifie him in the ſight of God?* Anſw. *Yes. The Authors profeſſed Diſſent as from certain other Brethren, ſo in ſpecial from Doctor* Grew, *late of* Coventry, *wherein is manifeſted, that although a Sinner needs nothing of the ſame kind more than Chriſts righteouſneſs to the ſaid end,* i. e. In genere cauſæ meritoriæ, *as a meritorious cauſe: nevertheleſs* (ſimpliciter loquendo, *to ſpeak the truth abſolutely*) *he needs many things, and thoſe of ſeveral kinds, to juſtifie him before God; and what thoſe things are is ſpecified at large.* p. 68

CHAP. XIII.

CHAP. XIII.

Q. *In what ſenſe is the word* (Faith) *to be taken in thoſe Scriptures, wherein forgiveneſs of ſin is inſinuated to be the fruit or conſequent of Faith, and wherein it is ſtyled the righteouſneſs of God, which is by Faith?* Anſw. *It is not taken ſtrictly, as excluding all other Evangelical graces in a ſinner,* viz. *Repentance and ſincere Reſolution for amendment of life; but in a large ſenſe as comprizing them, theſe being of the very eſſence of Faith, as juſtifying, or as taken* (*though not in a ſtrict Philoſophical, yet*) *in a Scriptural conſtruction or importance of the word.* p. 73

CHAP. XIV.

Another Scriptural Title given to the ſaid imputed righteouſneſs is in its being ſtyled, The righteouſneſs of the faith of *Abraham,* which he had being yet uncircumciſed, Rom. 4. 11. *The whole Verſe being opened more at large, and vindicated from miſ-interpretation too commonly received. Caution given for a due underſtanding as well of the Authors ſaid as true meaning, in his aſſerting Juſtification or Remiſſion of ſin* (*a righteouſneſs promiſed in the Law of Faith*) *to be it which S.* Paul *doth ſtyle the righteouſneſs of God, and which is by faith, the Author in that his aſſertion muſt not be underſtood as excluding, but*

as ſuppoſing and including that other branch or kind of righteouſneſs, which in the Goſpel or Law of Faith is commanded. p. 68

CHAP. XV.

Q. *Is there any thing expreſly ſaid in Scripture to be imputed to us for righteouſneſs?* Anſw. *Yes*, viz. *Faith, it being thus recorded in the Old Teſtament*, Gen. 15. 6. *and the record thereof produced in the New Teſtament once by* S. James, *chap.* 2. 23. *and twice by* S. Paul, Gal. 3. 6. *and* Rom. 4. 3. *in which Chapter he doth aſſert little leſs than ten times over, that* Abrahams *faith was imputed to him, and that the like or ſame ſpecificial faith ſhall be imputed to us for righteouſneſs*, ver. 3, 5, 9, 20, 22, 23, 24. p. 88

CHAP. XVI.

Q. *What is meant by faith in thoſe Scriptures both of the Old and New Teſtament, wherein it is ſaid to be imputed to Believers for Righteouſneſs? Is it to be taken properly for faith it ſelf, or figuratively, i. e. objectively, for Chriſts righteouſneſs the object of faith?* Anſw. *Properly for the thing faith, or faith it ſelf, the truth of which anſwer is proved by many reaſons, and cleared from certain objections, with the ſuffrage of the very learned and moſt induſtrious* Mr R. Baxter, *and reflection upon a paſſage of* Dr Grew *in his Sermons*

upon Jer. 23. 6. p. 91

CHAP. XVII.

Q. *Whence comes it to pass, that so many very learned and most pious men have so much and miserably mistaken the true meaning of the word* [Faith] *in its being said to be imputed to Believers for righteousness, they interpreting by faith not to be meant faith, but the righteousness of Christ?* Answ. *Four things are assigned as the causes of it, wherein much is spoken for the removing of them out of the way of truth, whereby they may no longer obstruct the free current thereof.* p. 104

CHAP. XVIII.

Q. *What is it for Faith* [*the thing it self Faith*] *to be imputed to Believers for Righteousness?* Answ. *There being a twofold righteousness, viz. Legal* [*commanded in the law of works, or innocency,*] *and evangelical (promised in the law of faith;) and there being also a difference betwixt these two sayings (Faith is imputed to us εἰς δικαιοσύνην, instead of righteousness, and εἰς δικαιοσύνην, To righteousness, this being the Apostles literal expression of the matter;) it is thereupon declared, How faith may be truly conceived and asserted to be imputed to believing sinners, both To Righteousness and instead of Righteousness. The Authors humble opinion touching the genuine*

sense

ſenſe of the phraſe, and the reaſons thereof rendred. p. 112

CHAP. XIX.

Q. *Upon what account, or from what cauſe, or cauſes is it, that faith (properly taken) is counted to Believers for righteouſneſs, or proves to them effectually available unto righteouſneſs?* Anſw. *The Queſtion is anſwered, 1. Negatively, Not* ab intrinſeco, *from ought, which is in the intrinſecal nature of faith, or the value and merit thereof. 2. Affirmatively, The cauſes aſſigned being wholly* ab extrinſeco, viz. *Gods mercy, Chriſts merit and the Goſpel covenant. Hereupon it is made apparent, that thoſe Proteſtant Writers, who do aſſert faith it ſelf to be imputed to Believers for or to righteouſneſs, do not dethrone the righteouſneſs of Chriſt, or ſet up any branch of mans own righteouſneſs in its ſtead.* p. 124

CHAP. XX.

Q. *Can ought, that is imperfect, poſſibly be by God imputed to a ſinner for, or to righteouſneſs?* Anſw. *Yes. The Authors profeſſed diſſent herein from certain other Brethren, whereof two onely by name are inſtanced in, whoſe words are recited, and a reply made thereunto.* p. 130

CHAP. XXI.

Q. *Under what notion, ſpecifical* conceptus, *or formal conſideration is faith (properly taken)*

ken) imputed to ſinners for, or to righteouſneſs? Anſw. *The Queſtion is anſwered at large clearly and diſtinctly,* i.e. *both Negatively and Affirmatively. An objection anſwered.* p. 140

CHAP. XXII.

Q. *Is there any perſonal righteouſneſs, which God ſees in a ſinner himſelf, upon the intuition whereof God is, or may be ſaid to be moved to juſtifie him?* Anſw. *Yes, in maintenance of the truth of which anſwer a copious reply is made to a contrariant paſſage in Doctor* Grews *Sermons upon* Jer. 23. 6. p. 145

CHAP. XXIII.

Q. *By whom is faith imputed to believing ſinners for, or unto righteouſneſs?* Anſw. *In anſwer hereunto that text in* Gen. 15. 6. *is vindicated from the miſconſtruction of ſome of the more ancient Rabbins, it being withal aſſerted, That it is God himſelf, who doth ſo impute it. But whether it was imputed to* Abraham *by God as Benefactor, or elſe as Eſtimator, or Judge, is left to conſideration upon what is ſaid in anſwer to a Queſtion, which is the ſubject of the Chapter enſuing.* p. 150

CHAP. XXIV.

Q. *Was not* Abraham *a Believer and his Faith thereupon actually imputed to him for Righteouſ-*

teouſneſs before he believed the promiſe recorded in Gen. 15. 5. *and that teſtimony given to his Faith* ver. 6? Anſw. *Yes: long before, his departure out of his native countrey* (Ur *of the* Caldees) *implying not only a local, but alſo a moral departure.* p. 154

CHAP. XXV.

Queſt. *Foraſmuch as* Abraham *was a Believer, and his Faith imputed to him for Righteouſneſs long before that Teſtimony given to his Faith in* Gen. 15. 6. *How was it true to ſay, that his believing in the Lord was then, or at that time imputed to him for righteouſneſs?* Anſw. *The Queſtion is anſwered ſeveral ways. A parallel Scripture concerning* Noah (Heb. 11. 7.) *opened, by occaſion whereof 4 Queſtions, with reference to that clauſe (And he became heir of the righteouſneſs, which is by faith) are propoſed and anſwered, 1. What kind of righteouſneſs is there meant? 2. What is it to be an heir of that kind of righteouſneſs? 3. What was that righteouſneſs, which* Noah *is there ſaid to have been heir of? or, Wherein did it conſiſt? 4. Why is the ſaid righteouſneſs ſtyled the righteouſneſs, which is by Faith?* p. 158

CHAP. XXVI.

Q. *What was the object of that faith of*

Abrahams, *which is ſaid to have been imputed to him for righteouſneſs?* Anſw. *Generally thoſe revelations, which God had imparted to him concerning his divine will,* i. e. *both* Mandati *and* beneplaciti: *both what God himſelf had promiſed to do, and alſo what he had commanded* Abraham *to do, the prime whereof (both the things commanded and promiſed) are made inſtances in; Hereupon ſix things as obſervable are commended to conſideration, with a reflection upon a paſſage in that very learned forein Writer, Doctor* And. Ryvet. p. 168

CHAP. XXVII.

Q. *VVhat was the object of the faith of* Abel, Enoch, Noah, *and other the faithfull Patriarchs of the old world before* Abraham *was?* Anſw. *Such things as were made known to them by ſupernatural revelation, which things are ſummarily ſaid to be Gods Exiſtence and his Beneficence, proved by* Heb. 11.6. *Hereupon two Queſtions are propoſed and anſwered,* 1. *VVhether Gods Exiſtence and Beneficence were not things of natural revelation, or made known by the light of nature?* 2. Q. *VVhether was it made known to the ſaid Patriarchs before the flood, that God (in Chriſt, or for Chriſts*

Christs sake) *was, or would be the Rewarder of them who diligently seek him?* p. 182

CHAP. XXVIII.

Q. *What is the object of that Christian faith, which in the New Testament is promised by God to be imputed to sinners for righteousness?* Answ. *Two remarkable differences in the object of their, and our Christian faith specified, the one styled Modal, the other Material, the object of our Christian faith being of larger extent, than that of the said Patriarchs. A refutation of those, who do assert* ens incomplexum, i. e. *the person of Christ to be the adequate object of justifying faith as justifying; as also of those, who will not extend the object of justifying faith* [*as justifying*] *so far as to whole Christ in person,* i. e. *to Christ as considered in all his Offices, but do restrain it to the formal consideration of him onely as a Priest. Three causes of this mistake in a late learned Latine Author. The suffrage of that most judicious and impartial Author* Le-Blanc *one of the very learned Professors of Divinity in* Sedan. p. 192

CHAP. XXIX.

Q. *Is it onely one act, or one kind of acts of faith, or else various acts thereof, and of*

of divers kinds, respectively whereunto it is said, That Abrahams *faith was imputed to him for righteousness?* Ans. *The most noted distinction of two kinds of the acts of faith, styled Elicite and Imperate, being premised, exemplified and explained, the Question it self is perspicuously answered; and this in way of dissent from those Brethren, who instruct sinners to believe, that they are to be justified onely by one act of faith, which act various Authors do use to express by various phrases, some whereof are indeed Scriptural expressions, and some of their own invention. Certain of these Authors are instanced in, and their words being recited, a reply is made thereunto, together with a passage in the larger Catechism of the late Assembly of Divines.* p. 205

CHAP. XXX.

A brief reply to a passage in Dr Owen, *he saying, That in the Doctrine by him asserted touching the imputation of Christs righteousness he hath as good company as the Prelacy and the whole Church of* England *can afford.* p. 226

THE

THE SECOND PART

Of a Diſcourſe concerning

IMPUTED RIGHTEOUSNESS.

CHAP. I.

Q. *Is there any kind of Righteouſneſs expreſly ſaid in Scripture to be imputed to Believers?* Anſw. *Yes, proved by* Rom. 4.6. *from which text together with the context it is alſo manifeſted, That forgiveneſs of ſin is that righteouſneſs, which for Chriſts ſake is there ſaid to be imputed to them. A diſtinction concerning a twofold Non-imputation of ſin commended to obſervation. The matter cleared from an Objection, with the Atteſtation of ſeveral worthy Authors.*

FOraſmuch as it doth not appear (as hath been ſaid in the former part of this Diſcourſe) that the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt is in any text of Scripture expreſly ſaid to be imputed to Believers for Righteouſneſs, or at all to be imputed to them;

I therefore think it not amiss to enquire, whether there be any other Righteousness explicitly, or in the express terms of Scripture said to be imputed to them, or ought else there said to be imputed to them for righteousness. These two grand Enquiries, with the Resolution of very many material and useful Questions pertaining thereunto, shall be the Subject of this Second part of the Discourse in hand.

‖Forgiveness of sin, I say, is the self-same thing with that Justification, which by the Righteousness of Jesus Christ was purchased for, and in his Gospel of Salvation is promised unto sinners conditionally upon their return to God by faith and repentance, or (to express the matter in the words of St. *Paul* in his farewel-Sermon at *Ephesus*, *Act.* 20. 21.) upon their repentance towards God, and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ, or (as he elsewhere expresseth it *Gal.* 5. 16.) upon such a faith as works by love,

1. Q. *Is there any kind of Righteousness expressly said in Scripture to be imputed to believing Sinners?*

Answ. Yes, as doth appear by *Rom.* 4. 6. where the words following are express, *Even as* David *describeth the blessedness of the man to whom God imputeth Righteousness.* And to what manner of persons this Righteousness is imputed, the Apostle informs us *v.* 11. he there asserting, That *Abraham received the sign of Circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith, which he had being yet uncircumcised, that he might be the Father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised, that Righteousness might be imputed unto them also.*

2. Q. *What is that Righteousness, which in the forecited Scriptures is said to be imputed by God to believing Sinners?*

Answ. 1. Negatively, Not Christs personal Righteousness, or Christs Righteousness in its Essential nature, or as properly taken, as hath been abundantly manifested in the former part of this Treatise.

2. Affirmatively, ‖ *Forgiveness* of sin (which indeed is all one with the Justification promised to Sinners) is that Righteousness, which is there said

to

to be by God imputed to Believers; Gods imputing Righteouſneſs unto them being the ſelf ſame thing with Gods forgiving them their ſins, his juſtifying or acquitting them from the guilt thereof. To the proof of the truth of this Anſwer, by way of Premiſal be it conſidered, that pardon of ſin, or Juſtification is in many places of Scripture ſtyled *Righteouſneſs*: among which at preſent I ſhall inſtance in a very few, reſerving the reſt for ſome other place. See *Rom.* 10. 10. *With the heart man believeth to righteouſneſs*, i.e. to Pardon of ſin, or Juſtification; as is plain by the Apoſtles words, as elſewhere in many of his Epiſtles, ſo in thoſe words of his Sermon preached in the Synagogue at *Antioch*, and recorded *Act.* 13.38,39. (*Through this man is preached unto you the forgiveneſs of ſins; and by him all that believe are juſtified—*) as alſo by thoſe words of St. *Peter*, *Act.* 10.43. *To him give all the Prophets witneſs, that whoſoever believeth in him ſhall receive remiſſion of ſin.* And this is that Righteouſneſs, which the Apoſtle ſays, that himſelf with other true Believers hoped for by the faith of Jeſus Chriſt, *i.e.* by embracing Chriſtianity in oppoſition to any other Religion profeſſed by *Jews* or *Gentiles*, *Gal.* 5. 5. In this ſenſe alſo the word *Righteouſneſs* ſeems to be taken in *Rom.* 5.*ult.* where, as ſin through the redundant guilt thereof is ſaid to have reigned unto death: ſo the grace and mercy of God in Chriſt is ſaid through Righteouſneſs, *i.e.* through the forgiveneſs of ſin, to reign to eternal life by Jeſus Chriſt our Lord.

Having manifeſted, that Forgiveneſs of ſin or Juſtification is ſtyled by the name of *Righteouſneſs* in other Scriptures, I ſhall now addreſs my ſelf to prove, that this is that Righteouſneſs, which is ſaid to be by God imputed to Believers, *Rom.* 4. 6.

and the matter ſeems apparent by the Context, *i. e.* by the words both foregoing and following the ſixth verſe of that Chapter: 1. The Apoſtle having aſſerted *v.* 5. that God by *faith* juſtifieth an ungodly man, *i.e.* an undeſerving man, a ſinner, a man in the ſtrict ſenſe of the Law unjuſt, he proves it by that deſcription, which *David* gives of the bleſſedneſs of that man, to whom the Lord imputeth imputeth Righteouſs without works. This plainly proves, that Gods juſtifying a Sinner, and Gods imputing Righteouſneſs to him are all one; and that Gods juſtifying, or imputing Righteouſneſs to a Believing ſinner, are the ſame thing with Gods pardoning his ſins, appears by the words following, quoted from the *Pſalmiſts* ſaying, *Bleſſed are they whoſe tranſgreſſions are forgiven, and whoſe ſins are covered: bleſſed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute ſin.* Whence be it it obſerved, 1. That that which St. *Paul* calls Gods imputing Righteouſneſs, *v.* 6. is interpreted to be his forgiving iniquities and covering ſin. He makes forgiveneſs of ſin a deſcription or declaration of the righteouſneſs, which is imputed to believers.

2. The Apoſtle by the *Pſalmiſt*'s ſaying (*Bleſſed is the man whoſe iniquities are forgiven, and whoſe ſins are covered*) makes him conſtructively to have ſaid, *Bleſſed is the man to whom the Lord imputeth righteouſneſs without works:* So that as he whoſe iniquities are forgiven, and to whom God imputeth righteouſneſs without works, is one and the ſame bleſſed perſon: ſo the forgiveneſs of ſins, and the righteouſneſs by God imputed to him is that very ſelf ſame thing that doth conſtitute him bleſſed, or wherein his bleſſedneſs doth conſiſt. And this is conſonant to what he ſays in the following Chapter, where *v.* 16. he calls the gift of Righteouſneſs

neſs the free gift of Offences; and what is the giving of an offence, but the forgiving of it, we being uſually ſaid to give a man that debt, which we forgive him?

3. If Gods forgiving Believers their iniquities and covering their ſins were not tantamount, or in effect the ſelf ſame thing with his imputing righteouſneſs unto them, that allegation from the *Pſalmiſt* would not have proved the point undertaken to be proved by the Apoſtle, *viz.* Gods juſtifying believing ſinners, or imputing righteouſneſs unto them.

4. Obſerve, that the Apoſtle in his allegation from the *Pſalmiſt*, ſaying *(Bleſſed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute ſin)* doth evidently make Gods not imputing ſin, and his imputing righteouſneſs to be phraſes of the ſelf-ſame importance, they being indeed the ſelf-ſame thing, and effected by one and the ſame act of God, only differently denominated from the *Terminus à quo*, & *ad quem*. And what is it for God not to impute ſin, but for God to forgive it; his not imputing ſin being one among thoſe many Negative phraſes, that are of frequent uſe in Scripture, whereby to expreſs his forgiving the ſame? 2 *Cor.* 5. 18. I grant indeed, that there is one kind of a Non-imputation of ſin mentioned in Scripture, which is not all one with forgiveneſs of ſin; for the better underſtanding whereof be it conſidered, That as the perſon is (whether guilty, or not guilty) who is accuſed of ſin: ſo is the Non-imputation of ſin unto him to be interpreted, whether of the pardoning, or not pardoning him. *E. g.* If the perſon be not guilty, by the not imputing ſin to him, is not meant the pardoning of the perſon, but the direct contrary, *viz.* the juſtifying him as not guilty;

in which ſenſe the phraſe is uſed 1 *Sam.* 22. 15. where *Abimelech* clearing himſelf doth beſeech *Saul*, who had him in ſuſpicion, to hold him guiltleſs, ſaying, *Let not the King impute any thing to his Servant* —. But if the perſon to whom ſin is ſaid not to be imputed, be indeed undeniably guilty, then by the Non-imputation of his ſin is meant the forgiveneſs thereof. There be theſe two ſenſible and remarkable differences betwixt the non-imputation of ſin, as applied to the ſaid different objects or ſubjects thereof (the guilty and not guilty) 1. As applied to the guiltleſs, the phraſe imports an acquitting or juſtifying from the guilt of fault; but as applied to the guilty, it imports an acquittance or juſtification from the guilt of puniſhment, this kind of Juſtification being it alone that a Sinner is a ſubject capable of, as hath been proved in the foregoing part of this diſcourſe.

The former Non-imputation of ſin is wholly of debt, and not at all of Grace; whereas the latter is directly contrary, *viz.* not of ſtrict debt, but wholly (in reſpect of us) of grace: And this is that gracious Non-imputation of ſin, which St. *Paul* doth in the Scripture forecited make to be all one with forgiveneſs of ſin (the ſubject thereof there ſpoken of being a Sinner, though a Believer) and with the imputation of Righteouſneſs, I mean that righteouſneſs, to which faith is ſaid to be imputed.

Laſtly, The meaning of the phraſe (*imputing righteouſneſs*) may be beſt interpreted by the contrary expreſſion of *imputing ſin*. The old Logical ſaying is herein verified, *Oppoſita juxta ſe poſita magis eluceſcunt*. Now what is it to impute ſin to a ſinner, but not to pardon him, to hold him guilty, and accordingly to puniſh him? And, if to impute

impute ſin be thus to do, to impute righteouſneſs muſt needs imply the contrary, *i.e.* to pardon, and to deal with a delinquent as righteous. I conclude therefore, that that righteouſneſs, which God is ſaid to impute unto believing ſinners, *Rom.* 4. 6. is nothing elſe but the forgiveneſs of their ſins, or acquitting them from that puniſhment, which for their unrighteouſneſſes was due unto them. And that the Imputation of Righteouſneſs to a believing ſinner doth not import more, than the plenary forgiveneſs of all his ſins, hath already ſufficiently (I hope) been manifeſted in the former part of this Diſcourſe; wherein hath been declared, that foraſmuch as there are ſins of Omiſſion as well as Commiſſion, no Sinner therefore can be ſaid to have his ſins of the former kind as well as the latter, not imputed to him, or pardoned, but he muſt be ſaid for that reaſon to have righteouſneſs imputed to him: for he who is judged, or dealt with in judgment as a perſon who hath omitted no good, muſt needs be dealt with as one who had performed all good, and therefore as a perſon perfectly and poſitively righteous.

Object. *Is not Faith it ſelf that very righteouſneſs, which God is ſaid to impute to every bleſſed perſon in that forecited Scripture* Rom. 4. 6 ?

Anſw. 1. I grant, that Faith it ſelf is of its kind righteouſneſs.

2. That Faith it ſelf is imputed to believing ſinners for righteouſneſs, as is frequently ſaid in this Chapter.

3. That Faith may in this ſenſe be rationally ſtyled a ſinners *imputed righteouſneſs*, becauſe it is conſtituted and accepted by God as the ſole condition of a ſinners righteouſneſs, pardon, or juſtification through Gods mercy in Chriſt.

4. I grant, that the connotation of Faith its being imputed to us for righteouſneſs, or as the condition of our pardon is not to be excluded, but is implied in thoſe words of the Apoſtle, *Rom.* 4. 6. *Bleſſed is the man to whom God imputeth righteouſneſs without works*: For it is by faith as the means or condition, by, or upon which God imputes righteouſneſs to ſinners, their faith being imputed to them to that end and purpoſe, as is oft ſaid by the Apoſtle in this Chapter, and of which I ſhall take occaſion to ſpeak more at large in the ſequel of this Diſcourſe. Yea, it is the ſcope of the Apoſtle in this and the foregoing Chapter, to ſhew what is and is not neceſſary on our parts in order to our juſtification, or the imputation of righteouſneſs unto us, which he aſſerts to be *faith* in oppoſition to the works there in queſtion, the neceſſity whereof was taught and obtruded upon believers by the falſe Teachers in thoſe times crept into the Churches of Chriſt newly planted. So that when it is ſaid by the Apoſtle in *Rom.*4.6. [*Bleſſed is the man, unto whom God imputeth righteouſneſs without works*] he meaneth no leſs, than if he ſayd more fully and explicitly, even as he doth in the foregoing Chapter *v.*28. [*We conclude, that a man is juſtified by faith without the deeds of the Law.*] Bleſſed is the man, unto whom God imputeth righteouſneſs by faith, or by means of faith without works, the works of the Law.

But Fifthly, Although God imputeth a believers Faith for, or to righteouſneſs; nevertheleſs it will not follow from thence, that the righteouſneſs, which God is ſaid to impute to believers in *Rom.*4. 6. is Faith it ſelf.

6. The truth is, that though Faith be imputed to ſinners as the condition qualifying, or capacita-

ting

ting them for righteouſneſs; nevertheleſs that righteouſneſs, for which, or to which it is ſaid to be imputed, or which it doth qualifie them for, is forgiveneſs of ſin, or Juſtification; and this is that Righteouſneſs it ſelf, which God is ſaid to impute to believing ſinners in that fore-alledged Text *Rom.* 4.6. As *faith* alone, *i. e.* faith in oppoſition to works of the Law obtruded by the falſe Apoſtles, is imputed as the Condition: ſo pardon of ſin is imputed to believing ſinners, as the full and formal nature of their righteouſneſs and juſtification. And it is of great concernment, that we preſerve in our minds diſtinct notions of faith and righteouſneſs in all ſuch Scriptures, wherein both the one and the other are ſaid to be imputed by God, faith being to be conceived of in the nature of a Condition impoſed, and righteouſneſs in the nature of a Reward in the Law of grace promiſed unto every penitent and believing Convert.

Leſt I ſhould ſeem to any Prejudicate perſon to be ſingular in the ſaid interpretation of *Rom.* 4.6. which I have ſo induſtriouſly, and (I hope) effectually both proved and cleared, I will cloſe this Chapter with the allegation of the teſtimonies of ſeveral Authors famous in their generation, abetting me in the ſame.

Remiſſio peccatorum eſt Juſtitia imputata, Our imputed righteouſneſs is forgiveneſs of ſin, ſays *Chamier, that incomparable confounder of all Popery, as Mr.* Robert Bolton *calls him, whom all the* Jeſuites *in Chriſtendom ſhall never be able to anſwer, whether in this world, or in the world to come,* Cham. tom. 3. l. 21 c. 19.

Juſtificatio hominis coram Deo nihil aliud eſt, quam remiſſio peccatorum. Piſc. on Act. 13.38, 39.

Notandum primo, Remiſſionem peccatorum eſſe juſtitiam noſtram, *This is firſt to be noted* (ſays *Muſculus* on Rom. 4. 6.) *that Remiſſion of ſins is our*

Righ-

Righteouſneſs—— *and the righteouſneſs of God, which is imputed to us, is that ſin is not imputed.*

Juſtitia imputata conſiſtit—*Imputed righteouſneſs* (ſays *Pareus* on Rom. 4.) *conſiſts in Gods gracious pardoning, covering, not imputing our ſins; this is its both privative and poſitive form. Again,* Imputata Juſtitia—— *Imputed righteouſneſs is not legal conformity, or inherent perfection, but gratuitous pardon of ſin.*

Calvin *on* Rom. 3. 21. calls this *a definition of the Righteouſneſs of faith* [Bleſſed are thoſe, whoſe iniquities are forgiven them;] and St. *Paul* teacheth, *that God juſtifieth men by not imputing their ſin. The like deſcription of this righteouſneſs,* ſays he, *ſee* 2 *Cor.* 5. *that which* v. 19. *he calls in God the* not imputing of ſin, *he calls in* v. 21. *a being* made the righteouſneſs of God in him. *He ſays on* Rom. 4. 6, 7. His verbis docemur—— *by theſe words we are taught, that* Righteouſneſs *with St.* Paul *is nothing elſe but* Remiſſion of ſin; *and he calls* Juſtification *the* imputation of righteouſneſs, *placing it in the* pardon of ſin: *Surely,* ſays he, *the Apoſtle diſputes not there of a part of Juſtification, but of the whole. And on* Act. 13. 38. *ſays he,* Hæc eſt juſtitia fidei—— *This is the Righteouſneſs of faith, while God reputes us for righteous by not imputing our ſins. And in his* Inſt. *l.* 3. *c.* 11. *Sect.* 21. Juſtitia fidei eſt—— *The righteouſneſs of faith is our reconciliation with God, which doth conſiſt in the ſole remiſſion of ſin.* See Mr. *Wott. De Reconc. Peccatoris,* wherein he doth at large declare both his own judgment and *Calvin*'s, with very many others, affirming, *that the righteouſneſs imputed without works is forgiveneſs of ſins.*

If we examine the doctrine of the Apoſtle St. Paul *and other Scriptures* (ſays that univerſally Learned and

and judicious Author Mr. *George Lawſon* in his *Theopol.* p. 311.) *we ſhall find, that remiſſion and imputation of righteouſneſs are taken for the ſame* —— and p. 312. *This imputation of righteouſneſs is the forgiveneſs of ſin.* Thus he determines, and (as I conceive) moſt juſtly and truly, in oppoſition to thoſe who hold, *that a ſinners juſtification doth conſiſt of two integral parts*, viz. *Remiſſion of ſin, and the Imputation of Chriſts righteouſneſs.*

I will conclude this Chapter with the ſweet saying of *Bernard*, that moſt affectionate Poſtiller, on *Cant. Dei juſtitia eſt non peccare, hominis autem juſtitia eſt Dei indulgentia, Not to ſin is Gods righteouſneſs, but mans Righteouſneſs is Gods indulgent pardon*: And with the firſt words in the firſt *Homily* of Salvation (which I had almoſt forgot to recite) they being as followeth: *I mean the* Homilies *of our Church.*

Becauſe all men be ſinners and offenders againſt God, and breakers of his Law and Commandments, therefore can no man by his own acts, words and deeds (ſeem they never ſo good) be juſtified and made righteous before God; but every man is of neceſſity conſtrained to ſeek for another righteouſneſs or juſtification to be received at Gods own hands, that is to ſay, the forgiveneſs of his ſins and treſpaſſes in ſuch things as he hath offended: And this juſtification or righteouſneſs (viz. the Forgiveneſs of ſins) which we ſo receive of Gods Mercy and Chriſts Merits, embraced by faith, is taken, accepted and allowed by God for our perfect and full juſtification.

By theſe words it appears, what was the Judgment of our firſt Proteſtant Reformers concerning a ſinners Righteouſneſs, or Juſtification, viz. that the eſſence or nature thereof doth conſiſt in Forgiveneſs of ſin; and that this is the Righteouſneſs of ſinners, which is upon their faith imputed to them

them by God, and allowed by him in mercy and for the Merits ſake of Chriſt, for their perfect and full juſtification. Nor doth Juſtification put a ſinner any more into a ſtate of acceptation, or grace and favour with God, than doth Remiſſion of ſin: I do not ſay, than ſuch a bare remiſſion of ſin, which we may by our underſtandings abſtractedly conceive or fancy in our minds; but than ſuch a plenary Remiſſion of ſin, as in the Goſpel is promiſed to penitent ſinners. This hath been aſſerted and proved in the 22*d. Chapter* of the firſt part of this Diſcourſe.

CHAP II.

Q. *What manner of Righteouſneſs is forgiveneſs of ſin?* Anſw. *In order to the reſolution of the Queſtion a diſtinction concerning a twofold Righteouſneſs is premiſed (the word* Righteouſneſs *implying ſometimes* Officium, *duty commanded; and ſometimes* Beneficium, *mercy promiſed:) which diſtinction being alſo in other words apt for edification expreſſed, the Queſtion it ſelf is thereupon plainly determined.*

Q. *What manner of Righteouſneſs is Forgiveneſs of ſin?*

Anſw. In order to the ſolution of this Queſtion be it conſidered, that the word [*Righteouſneſs*] is in Scripture taken in a twofold ſenſe, either as importing *Officium*, or *Beneficium*, Mans duty, or Gods

Gods mercy; or as it may be not unfitly in two words expreſſed, *Work*, or *Wages*: 1. It ſignifies certain duty, or duties commanded by God, and by man to be performed, in which ſenſe it is all one with *holineſs of living*. In this ſenſe it is taken *Luke* 1.75. *That we might ſerve him in holineſs and righteouſneſs before him all the daies of our life*; where there is no neceſſity to confine the word [*Righteouſneſs*] to the duties of th Second Table, and the word [*Holineſs*] to the duties of the Firſt; but both words may well and warrantably be taken as Synonymous, the word [*Holineſs*] being ſometimes uſed in Scripture as expreſſive of the duties of the Second Table, 1 *Theſſ.*4.3,4,7. and the word [*Righteouſneſs*] as comprehenſive of the offices belonging to both Tables, *Hoſ.*10.12. *Sow to your ſelves in Righteouſneſs*; the meaning of which phraſe is commenſurate with that of the Apoſtle, of *Sowing to the Spirit*, Gal.6.8. And in this latitude the word *Righteouſneſs* is uſed by St. *Peter*, 1.*Pet.*2.24. *That we being dead unto ſin, might live unto Righteouſneſs*; this phraſe of *living unto Righteouſneſs* being of the ſame extent in ſenſe and ſignification with that of the ſame Apoſtle elſe where, *i.e. of living not to the luſts of men, but to the will of God*, 1 Pet.4. 2. and of St. *Pauls* expreſſion, *i. e. of living not to our ſelves, but to him that died for us, and roſe again*, 2 Cor.5.15.

2. The word [*Righteouſneſs*] is ſometimes uſed in Scripture as importing certain Mercy by God promiſed to ſinners, and according to the tenour of divine Promiſe conferr'd upon them. In this ſenſe its taken *Iſa.* 48. 18. *O that my people had hearkned to my Commandments* (this had been their Righteouſneſs in the former ſenſe of the word, as appears by that expreſs Scripture in *Deut.* 6. 25.) *then had thy*

thy peace been as a River, and thy righteouſneſs as the waves of the Sea. In this ſenſe the word [*Righteouſneſs*] ſeems to be taken in *Prov.* 8. 18. where *Wiſdom* is commended from this, that there is with her *durable riches* and *righteouſneſs.* And in one place (*viz. Hoſ.* 10.12.) the word being repeated is uſed in both the ſaid ſenſes, *Sow to your ſelves in Righteouſneſs* (there the word implies Duty commanded) *till he come and rain Righteouſneſs upon you* (there it imports Mercy promiſed.) The former is ſtyled the Doing of righteouſneſs, 1 *Joh.*3.7.(*He that doth righteouſneſs, is righteous*) the latter is ſtyled the Receiving of righteouſneſs, *Pſal.* 24. 5. (*He ſhall receive the bleſſing from the Lord, and Righteouſneſs from the God of his Salvation.*) The former may not unfitly be ſtyled The work of Righteouſneſs; the latter The effect, or the fruit, or the reward of Righteouſneſs.

2. Or to the ſame purpoſe, as hath been already ſaid, I may expreſs the matter in manner and form following, and ſay, Foraſmuch as the word *Righteouſneſs* is relative to the Law, and foraſmuch as the divine Law doth conſiſt of two parts, the Preceptive and Retributive part, commonly ſtyled the Precept and the Sanction, *Righteouſneſs* may be denominated from its relation to each part of the Law: 1. To the Precept, or preceptive part thereof, which is the Rule of mans living, and doth conſtitute *debitum Officii*, that which is due from man to God. 2. To the Sanction, or Retributive part of the Law (the Promiſes and Threatnings thereof) that doth conſtitute *debitum Præmii & Supplicii*, what ſhall be mans due from God in the way of reward and puniſhment.

Now (to apply the diſtinction) when I ſay, that Forgiveneſs of ſin is a Righteouſneſs of its

kind

kind, and oft-times meant by the word [*Righteouſneſs*] in Scripture, particularly in *Rom.* 4. 6. I muſt be underſtood, that it is a Righteouſneſs of this latter kind, *i. e.* as it imports not mans Duty, but divine Mercy; not our Work, but Reward; not as denominated from the Preceptive, but from the Retributive part of the Law; in which ſenſe pardon of ſin is frequently in Scripture ſtyled *Righteouſneſs*, two or three places whereof have already been made inſtance in, to which many more might be added: For in this ſenſe it ſeems to be taken *Rom.* 6. 16. *Know ye not, that to whom ye yield your ſelves ſervants to obey, his ſervants ye are to whom ye obey, whether of ſin unto death, or of obedience unto righteouſneſs?* Where, as *ſin* and *obedience*, ſo *death* (the puniſhment of ſin) and *righteouſneſs* (a right to impunity, or deliverance from the puniſhment deſerved by ſin) are oppoſed; and therefore *Righteouſneſs* muſt in all reaſon be taken in ſuch a ſenſe, as is directly oppoſite to *death* (the wages of ſin) and what can that be in effect, but the remitting, or remiſſion of it? This is that which St. *Paul* doth elſewhere ſtyle The gift of Righteouſneſs, *Rom.* 5. 17. *If by one mans offence death reigned by one, much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteouſneſs, ſhall reign in life by one Jeſus Chriſt.* What he there ſtyles The gift of Righteouſneſs, he doth in the verſe foregoing ſtyle The free gift of Offences, *i. e.* the free forgiveneſs of Offences: For as ſins are ſtyled Debts, and we thereupon are ſaid to give men that Debt, which we do forgive them: ſo the forgiveneſs of Offences is there ſtyled The gift of Offences, he retaining the word *gift*, v. 17. and what he doth elſewhere oft-times ſtyle Righteouſneſs, he doth there ſtyle The gift of Righteouſneſs;

and

and it ſeems worth the noting, that it is a thing not unuſual with the Penmen of Scripture (as ſome Learned men have obſerved) to accommodate or ſuit their expreſſions one to another, of which among many other which might be produced, are the inſtances following, *viz. Jer.*33.17. where, upon mention of the word [*Liberty*] follows the expreſſion [*liberty to the Sword*;] and *Rom.*14.13. where the Apoſtle having ſaid, *Let us no longer judge, i.e.* cenſure one another, he ſuits thereunto his following expreſſion, ſaying, *But judge this rather*; and *Matth.*5.19. where our Saviour having ſpoken of them, who *break the leaſt of Gods Commandments*, he accommodates his following words thereunto, ſaying, *He ſhall be called leaſt in the Kingdom of heaven*; as alſo in *Matth.*12.50.where, upon the mention of his Mother and Brethren ſeeking him, Chriſts reply thereunto is in a ſuitable phraſe, ſaying, *Whoſoever doth the will of my Father, the ſame is my Brother, and Siſter, and Mother.* But to return: As Forgiveneſs of ſin is ſtyled Righteouſneſs, ſo a perſon pardoned is upon that account ſaid to be Righteous, *Rom.* 5.19. *As by one mans diſobedience many were made ſinners, ſo by the obedience of one ſhall many be made righteous*; where, as by the word *Sinners* is meant guilty, or obnoxious to condemnation, ſo by the word *Righteous* (which is directly oppoſite thereunto) the plain contrary to it muſt neceſſarily be underſtood, *i.e.* not obnoxious to condemnation, pardoned or juſtified, as appears alſo by the context. And in this ſenſe is the word *Sinner*, as oppoſed to *Righteous* in the ſaid ſenſe aſſerted, taken oft-times in other Scriptures, *i.e.* as importing ſubjection not to the power of ſin, at leaſt not it directly and immediately, but ſubjection to the guilt of ſin; in

which

which ſenſe our Saviour Chriſt doth vindicate the Woman in *Luke* 7. from being a Sinner, as ſhe was charged by one of the *Phariſees*, v. 39; this he doth by proving in his diſcourſe (whether with *Simon* the Phariſee, or *Simon* the Apoſtle) the direct contrary, *viz.* that her ſins were forgiven her: this he proves by her love to him, and therefore ſhe was no longer a Sinner, but Righteous, *i.e.* not obnoxious to condemnation. And in the like ſenſe the word ſeems to be taken in that ſaying of the Apoſtle *Rom.* 3. 7. *Why am I judged as a Sinner?* that is, He in that ſaying perſonating our objecting againſt his doctrine concerning our own Righteouſneſs commending the Righteouſneſs of God, ſays, Why am I judged, complained of and dealt with as one obnoxious to puniſhment? Thus the word [*Sinner*] is alſo taken in 1 *King.* 1 21. where *Bathſheba* taking a courſe for the future ſecurity of her ſelf and hers after *Davids* death, ſays thus unto him, *Otherwiſe it ſhall come to paſs, when my Lord the King ſhall ſleep with his Fathers, that I and my Son* Solomon *ſhall be counted ſinners, i.e.* ſhall be dealt with as obnoxious to ſuffering. Why Forgiveneſs of ſin is ſtyled Righteouſneſs, will be declared in the following Chapter. I will only add, As righteouſneſs and unrighteouſneſs are meaſured by the Retributive part of the Law (the Promiſſory and Comminatory part thereof) he is unrighteous, who hath no right to impunity, but is obliged to the puniſhment threatned, both of loſs and ſenſe; and he is righteous, who is diſobliged from this puniſhment threatned, or hath right to the contrary (both Privative and Poſitive) good promiſed. And in this reſpect, I ſay, Forgiveneſs of ſin is ſtyled Righteouſneſs, and a perſon pardoned ſaid to be Righteous.

CHAP III.

Q. *Why is Forgiveneſs of ſin in Scripture ſtyled Righteouſneſs, or a perſon pardoned there ſaid to be Righteous?* Anſw. *The Queſtion for the more clearneſs of underſtanding is anſwered both Negatively and Affirmatively. A Caution to prevent the miſconſtruction of ſome places in Scripture, and two Rules ſuggeſted as conducing to a right interpretation thereof. A few brief Animadverſions upon ſome paſſages in Mr.* Will. Bradſhawes *Latin Diſſertation concerning Juſtification.*

Q. *Why is Forgiveneſs of ſin ſtyled Righteouſneſs, or a perſon pardoned ſaid to be Righteous?*

Anſw. 1. Negatively, The Reaſon is not, becauſe it doth make a ſinner to be righteous in ſuch a ſenſe, or in that very ſenſe as Righteouſneſs is taken for Holineſs, for a *Non reatus culpæ*, *i.e.* for a conformity to the Preceptive part of Gods Law: for as he, who was alwaies thus perfectly Righteous, is not naturally capable of pardon; ſo it is impoſſible, that any unrighteous perſon ſhould by any means whatſoever be made righteous, *i.e.* no ſinner, or a perſon who never ſinned.

2. Although an unrighteous perſon may ceaſe the practice of his former unrighteouſnes and become righteous, *i.e.* holy for the future; yea, although

though every pardoned ſinner doth in that ſenſe become righteous; nevertheleſs it is not the pardon of ſin, that doth make or conſtitute him righteous in that ſenſe: For in order of nature an unrighteous perſon doth thus become righteous, *i.e.* he breaks off his ſins by righteouſneſs before he is pardoned, or is in a proximate moral capacity for pardon.

3. It is by Sanctification, and not by Remiſſion of ſin (by that change, which is commonly by Divines ſtyled *Real*, and not by this ſtyled *Relative*) that an unrighteous perſon is in this ſenſe made righteous. Theſe Anſwers, together with the foreſaid diſtinction of Righteouſneſs, are the rather to be minded, becauſe the not heeding thereof ſeems to be the cauſe of ſome errour in the Papiſts, who ſtill taking the word *Righteous* for *Holy*, and *Righteouſneſs* for *Holineſs*, have wronged themſelves and the truth in confounding Juſtification and Sanctification, and making Remiſſion of ſin to conſiſt not only in taking away the guilt of it, but alſo in the change of our depraved qualities and converſations, whereby of unrighteous we become inherently righteous. Whereas the truth is, that although this change be required in order to Forgiveneſs of ſin (for that God may have mercy upon the wicked in his abundant pardon, *the wicked muſt forſake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts*, Iſa. 55. 7,8.) nevertheleſs it is not effected by a pardon; yea, becauſe it is an external pre-requiſite thereunto, therefore in reaſon it cannot be conceived to be effected by it, neither is it any ingredient into pardon as conſtituting the preciſe nature of it, I mean as this change is a duty impoſed upon us, or a work to be done by us, *Ezek.* 18. 31.

2. Affirmatively; 1. Becauſe it is equivalent to that righteouſneſs, which ſtands in a perfect conformity to Gods Law, or which conſiſts in perfect Innocency. It is a Righteouſneſs by account, conſtruction, or interpretation, as having, although not the real ſubſtance, yet the legal priviledges and benefits of the ſaid perfect innocency and conformity: for he whoſe unrighteouſneſs is forgiven, is in as bleſſed and comfortable a condition (as to freedom from puniſhment) as he, who never did tranſgreſs the Law. And for this cauſe it may well be ſtyled an *Imputed righteouſneß* (in that ſenſe as the word *Imputed* is properly and commonly taken in the writings of St. *Paul*) that is, a Righteouſneſs by *Imputation*, or *account*; becauſe a ſinner, whoſe unrighteouſneſs is pardoned, ſhall be dealt with as if he were righteous, notwithſtanding that he is not righteous as a fulfiller of the Law of Innocency, or as a perſon who never tranſgreſſed.

2. Becauſe, as in reſpect of the Preceptive part of the Law Forgiveneſs of ſin is a *righteouſneß* interpretatively, ſo in reſpect of the Retributive part it is only ſuch. A perſon pardoned, although he cannot ſtrictly and properly be denominated *righteous* reſpectively to the precept of the Law, nevertheleſs he may truly and properly (without any ſuch terms of diminution as *Quaſi*, or *Tanquam*) be ſo ſtyled with reſpect to the ſanction of the Law, the Law having no right to puniſh him, ſuch an one being diſobliged from its puniſhing power: The Law of God (as to its Condemnatory part) hath no more power over a ſinner, when his ſin is pardoned, than the Law of the Husband hath over the Wife, when he is dead, *Rom.* 7. 1. for *Pardon* is the death of ſin reſpectively to its guilt, it gives

ſin

ſin its deadly wound, it ſlays the enmity of the Law reſpectively to its ſanction, and being thus ſlain, the ſinner is looſed from it, as a Woman once obliged by the Law of her Husband while living, is looſed from it by his death. And upon this conſideration a perſon, whoſe unrighteouſneſs is forgiven, and whoſe ſins are covered, may well be denominated *Righteous*.

Before I proceed to ſpecifie any other reaſon, why Gods pardoning ſinners is ſtyled his *imputing righteouſneſs* to them, be it obſerved by the way, and by occaſion of what was laſt ſaid, *viz.* that Forgiveneſs of ſin being conſidered as a proper righteouſneſs reſpectively to the ſanction of the Law, ſo Gods imputing it is verily and indeed all one with his imparting it, and implies no more than his giving or beſtowing it upon believing ſinners, in which improper ſenſe of the word [*Imputing*] certain Learned men do conceive it to be taken in ſome places of Scripture. Any matter of profit, benefit, or advantage (ſays Mr. *J. Goodwin*) which any waies accrueth to a man, whether by way of due debt, or of free donation and grant, may be ſaid to be imputed to him accordingly; in which ſenſe he underſtands the word in *Rom.* 4. 4. where the reward is ſaid to be reckoned or imputed to him that worketh, *i. e.* that by works deſerves or earns it, of debt and not of grace. And ſo *Parens* having diſtinguiſhed of a threefold imputation of a good thing (*jure, injuriâ, & gratiâ*) ſays, That a thing, when it is ſaid to be imputed of right and of debt, is then ſaid to be imputed in an improper ſenſe of the word, *Imputari pro Dari*, to be imputed being all one as to be given, or conferr'd, in which improper ſenſe of the word we are ſaid to impute glory to God, *i. e.* to give glory

to him; and in this ſenſe he interprets that ſaying of the Apoſtle, *Operanti*, to him that worketh is the reward imputed, *i.e.* is given not of grace, but of debt.

2. Be it obſerved, that that Righteouſneſs, which in *Rom.* 4.6, 11. is ſtyled *Juſtitia imputata*, imputed righteouſneſs, is in the following Chapter in effect ſtyled *Juſtitia donata*; he plainly ſtyling it *Donum, & Donum gratuitum, & Donum juſtitiæ*, the Gift, the free Gift, and the Gift of Righteouſneſs, *v.* 16, 17. *i.e.* Righteouſneſs freely given. So that whether by Gods imputing this righteouſneſs to believers we are neceſſarily to underſtand more than his free giving it to them, or beſtowing it upon them, I ſhall not take upon me peremptorily to determine, but will leave to conſideration.

3. Forgiveneſs of ſin is ſtyled *Righteouſneſs*, as ſome judge, for the ſame reaſon as they think it to be ſtyled *Juſtification*, *viz.* becauſe it is merited or procured by the ſatisfactory Righteouſneſs of the Lord Jeſus Chriſt. And this is the reaſon, which is rendred by the learned and pious Author Mr. *W. Bradſhaw*: *For the Law*, ſays he, *having two parts (the Injunction and the Commination,) there is a twofold Righteouſneſs*, viz. *of Obedience in reference to the former, and of Juſtification in reference to the latter; upon which Satisfaction therefore, as given and taken, a perſon though a ſinner is deemed righteous.* And the ſaid Author addeth, ſaying, *By ſatisfaction made Gods Law is fulfilled, for aſmuch as his Will was, either that the Law ſhould be obſerved, or elſe the penalty ſuffered; if therefore the one or the other be done, the Will of the Lawgiver is ſatisfied, ſo that he for whoſe ſins a full ſatisfaction hath been made (either by himſelf, or by ſome other for him) and hath been accepted by him, againſt whom*

whom the transgression was committed, is as just and righteous as he that never transgressed; there being as much justice and righteousness in repairing the wrongs and injuries done to any, as there is in abstaining from doing any. E. g. *He that by his Cattel hath trespassed against his Neighbour in his Grass, or Corn, and hath made him full satisfaction for the spoil done, or dammage sustained, is as honest and just a Neighbour, and deals as righteously with him, as he that never trespassed in that kind. Wherefore our pardon coming to us, or being derived upon us in the way, or by means of satisfaction made by Christ to the Justice of God for the breach of his Law, may fitly for that reason be styled Righteousness, and a sinner pardoned may be denominated Righteous upon that account.*

Thus have I related the reason, as rendred by the fore-named Author, the force whereof I leave to the judgment of others; only saying, that for my own part I shall not much urge or insist upon it for these two reasons: 1. Because the pardon of sin *Quocunque modo*, whether with, or without satisfaction given and taken, doth take away the guilt of punishment, and disoblige from suffering, and doth consequently so far forth make the Delinquent just and righteous. 2. Because I judge, that the two first reasons before specified are sufficiently satisfactory to the Question in hand, *Why Forgiveness of sin is styled Righteousness.* I would thereupon now immediately close this Chapter, were it not, that I think it my part for the Truths sake, and prevention of Errour, to Animadvert upon somewhat, that is cautiously to be understood in the forecited passage from the Author before named. E.g. Whereas the said Author speaks of a Righteousness resulting upon satisfaction given, and

accepted, we must not so understand it, as if a sinner were actually pardoned, and made righteous immediately upon Christs satisfaction given, and accepted: for Christs satisfaction is only the meritorious cause of a Sinners pardon and righteousness, and although God did accept it as such, or so far forth, so soon as given, yea, so soon as undertaken to be made, nevertheless it was not the intent of God, or Christ, that a Sinner should be actually pardoned, or for it immediately be made righteous; but that for the sake of it he should be pardoned, or constituted righteous in his appointed time and way, by or upon the intervention of a sinners sincere faith and repentance. Yea, this Caution, I think, is very expedient to be observed for the due interpretation of many places of Scripture, where pardon of sin is spoken of, they being to be understood not of actual, but of virtual pardon, which some Authors style pardon inchoate, *i.e.* of pardon *Quoad pretium*, or *Quantum ad Meritum*, of pardon so far forth as purchased by a price paid and accepted. *E.g. Rom.*5.9,10. where it being said, *That being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him; and if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son.*— We are not necessarily there to understand it of actual justification and reconciliation with God (for this belongs not to enemies, while they are such,) but of virtual justification and reconciliation, *i.e.* that we are, as far as belongs to Christs part as Satisfier, justified, pardoned, or reconciled, the price thereof being by him paid and accepted by his Father; all which may very well be, while a sinner doth remain as is said *v.* 6. ἀσθενὴς, weak and deadly sick, or in a state of enmity, as is said *v.* 10. Yea, all which

may

may be ſaid to be before a ſinner be a ſinner, yea, before he have an exiſtence *in rerum naturâ*, even as Creatures, before they do actually exiſt, are ſaid to be in their exiſtent cauſes; even ſo a ſinners pardon, before the ſinner himſelf be actually pardoned, may be ſaid to be in Chriſt, or in the death of Chriſt as the meritorious cauſe thereof; in which reſpect all the Sinners in the world may in ſome ſenſe be ſaid to be now juſtified, or pardoned, *i. e.* conditionally pardoned, or juſtified by the blood of Chriſt, according to that of the Apoſtle *Rom.*5.18. *Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even ſo by the righteouſneſs of one, the free gift came upon all men unto juſtification of life.* And for the right underſtanding of that in *Rom.*5.9. with many other the like Scriptures, two things are moreover, as I think, remarkable:

1. That (as I have ſomewhere read in the moſt Learned Dr. *Hammond*) paſſive verbs and particles being uſed in Scripture, are ſometimes to be conſtrued as real paſſives, and ſometimes only as nominal, *i. e.* as denoting ſometimes the action with the reality of the paſſion, or effect thereof in the ſubject wrought upon, and ſometimes importing only the action of the agent without the ſaid effect.

2. It is the manner of Scripture oft-times to ſpeak of the effect as wrought, when proviſion is made of a cauſe ſufficient *in ſuo genere*, by which it ſhall or may be wrought. Thus St. *Paul* ſpeaks of Death as already aboliſhed by Chriſt, 2 *Tim.* 1. 10. becauſe Chriſt hath merited the abolition thereof, although Death is not as yet actually and fully aboliſhed, nor ſhall be till the general Reſurrection, this being the laſt Enemy to be deſtroyed. Thus alſo Chriſt is ſaid by *one offering to have*

per-

perfected for ever them that are ſanctified, Heb. 10. 14.

I have the rather thought meet to Animadvert as above, upon the paſſage forecited out of the ſaid Author, becauſe it ſeems to have been the miſtake, as of certain others, ſo of that Learned Author himſelf, to conceive that a ſinner is juſtified, pardoned, or made righteous upon Chriſts ſatisfaction given, and taken, as is too too ſuſpicious by certain of his miſtakes in his Tractate of *Juſtification*, ch. 26. (Latin Copy) which it concerns young Students in the reading thereof to beware of: he there ſaid (ch. 13.) *That our effectual vocation doth follow our reconciliation with God:* and (ch. 15. he ſays) that the reaſon, why Faith is called *Juſtifying*, is, *becauſe it doth then firſt declare us in our Conſciences to be righteous in the ſight of God for the ſatisfaction of Chriſt:* and (ch. 24.) he poſitively aſſerts, *That Faith is the effect of Juſtification, and therefore that Juſtification doth not depend upon it.* The cauſe of theſe groſs Miſtakes in that Author was, as I think, his miſ-conceiving a ſinners Juſtification, or pardon, to exiſt immediately upon Chriſts ſatisfaction given and taken in his behalf, and his not diſtinguiſhing betwixt *Reconciliation*, *Remiſſion of ſin*, or *Juſtification* as barely merited, and as actually conferr'd: And for that cauſe it is uſeful to obſerve, that albeit our effectual Vocation doth follow our Reconciliation *quoad meritum*, or as it is *nudè parta*, *i. e.* as barely purchaſed by the Blood of Chriſt; yet it goes before it *quoad efficaciam*, or as it is actually conferr'd. And be it further obſerved, that the reaſon of Faiths being called *Juſtifying*, is not either primarily, or principally, and much leſs only, becauſe it doth manifeſt us in our Conſciences to be juſtified, but becauſe it doth

Juo

ſuo modo, ſcilicet per modum conditionis præſtitæ, i. e. as the condition of our Juſtification actually performed, it doth introduce our Juſtification, or actually juſtifie us by, or in the virtue of Gods promiſe, Faith being therein conſtituted the condition thereof, and conſequently our Juſtification depending upon our Faith, as *Res conditionata* doth depend, or is ſuſpended upon that, which in any promiſe is conſtituted the condition of enjoying it. But I acknowledge this a digreſſion from the matter in hand.

CHAP. IV.

Q. *What peculiar Names have certain Modern Authors uſed to give to the ſaid imputed, or imparted Righteouſneſs (the Non-imputation of ſin) whereby to diſtinguiſh it from that other kind of righteouſneſs, which doth conſiſt in a practical conformity to the Law of God?*

Anſw. *They have diſtinguiſhed them by ſuch Names, or Epithetes as theſe,* viz. *Active and Paſſive; Negative and Poſitive; Proper and Improper; Literal and Interpretative; Legal and Pro-legal; to which is added, Primary and Secondary, with the Author's Opinion concerning the fitneſs of the ſaid diacritical, or diſtinguiſhing Titles.*

Q. *ARe there any peculiar Names, or Titles given to the ſaid imputed Righteouſneſs,* i.e. *to forgiveneſs of ſin, whether by humane Authors*

thors, or in the Sacred Scriptures, whereby to diſtinguiſh it from that other kind of Righteouſneſs ſaid to conſiſt in a conformity to the Precept, or Precepts of the Law.

Anſw. Yes: the truth of which Anſwer I ſhall exemplifie by inſtances of both kinds, the former whereof ſhall be the Subject of this Chapter. I have obſerved, That the righteouſneſs of pardon is for diſtinctions ſake by certain Modern Writers ſtyled a *Paſſive righteouſneſs*, and the other *Active:* And I do judge them very fitly ſo denominated, becauſe reſpectively to the one we are Patients, or the Subjects recipient; and with reſpect to the other we are Agents. And thus is the matter expreſſed in Scripture. *Wrought righteouſneſs*, Heb. 11.33. *Worketh righteouſneſs*, Pſal. 15. 2. *Receive righteouſneſs*, Pſal. 24. 5. *Receive forgiveneſs of ſin*, Act. 26. 18.

2. It is ſtyled a *Negative*, or *Privative righteouſneſs*, and the other *Poſitive*. And I do judge the former word no leſs fit in its application than the latter, becauſe forgiveneſs of ſin is in Scripture expreſſed by a Not-imputing it, and ſaid to be a righteouſneſs without Works; as will be declared more at large in the following Chapter.

3. It is by ſome Author, or Authors ſtyled an *improper Righteouſneſs*; and this among others is the denomination given to it by the Learned Mr. *J. Goodwin*, who calls the other kind of Righteouſneſs a *Proper righteouſneſs*. But whether this denomination be ſo fit, I doubt: for ſeeing there are two parts of the Law, the Precept and the Sanction (as was ſaid in the Chapter immediately foregoing) and foraſmuch as a perſon may be denominated righteous reſpectively either to the one, or to the other; I therefore judge it to be juſtly

queſti-

queſtionable, whether a man may not properly be denominated righteous from the one, as well as from the other, or whether a diſ-obligation from puniſhment be not in propriety of Speech a Righteouſneſs of its kind, as Non-obligation to fault is a proper Righteouſneſs of another kind If any Reader therefore be diſſatisfied with thoſe diſtinguiſhing terms (*Proper* and *Improper*,) he will, I preſume, be better pleaſed with the terms, which I will here ſuggeſt inſtead thereof, *viz. Primary* and *Secondary*. Although I do not remember, that I have read the Terms thus uſed, and applied in any other Authors; nevertheleſs as the Terms are obvious to be thought upon, ſo I think them in this caſe to be very fit, foraſmuch as that Righteouſneſs, which doth conſiſt in a conformity to the precept of the Law is primely intended, there being no place for the other, but upon the defect of this, for which cauſe that other may be ſaid to be *Secunda tabula poſt naufragium juſtitiæ prioris*.

4. It is by ſome called a *Righteouſneſs conſtructively*, or by interpretation, and the other a *Literal* or *Text-righteouſneſs*; and by theſe terms (to my remembrance) doth the ſaid Learned Author Mr. *J. Goodwin* diſtinguiſh them. But this expreſſion of his doth (I think) need Explication, and muſt be warily underſtood: for although forgiveneſs of ſin reſpectively to the preceptive part of the Law be a Righteouſneſs only by interpretation, or imputation (in the ſtrict and proper ſenſe of the word imputed,) or *in loco*, *i. e.* a Righteouſneſs inſtead of a Righteouſneſs; nevertheleſs reſpectively to the Retributive part of the Law (deſtroyed, aboliſhed, or ſpoiled of its damning power) it is truly, properly, and literally a Righteouſneſs.

5. For-

5. Forgiveneſs of ſin is ſomewhere (to my remembrance) in the Writings of Mr. *Baxter* ſtyled our *Juſtitia Pro-legalis*, our *Pro-legal righteouſneſs*; and (if I do not miſ-remember) Chriſts ſatisfaction, or *Satisfactory righteouſneſs* is by him ſo ſtyled alſo: and, I think, that both of them may well and rationally be ſo called, becauſe both of them do beſtead us (Sinners) inſtead of that primary Righteouſneſs, which doth conſiſt in a conformity to the Precept of the Law; yet with ſome difference, each of them after their manner, in a diverſe way, or upon an account peculiar to each, *viz.* our pardon it ſelf as the matter, which doth conſtitute that our Righteouſneſs, and Chriſts ſatisfactory Righteouſneſs as the Meritorius cauſe thereof. And be it obſerved, that I do not ſay, as Chriſts Righteouſneſs is in it ſelf immediately imputed to us (for this is that Doctrine, which hath been profeſſedly oppoſed, and at large refuted in the foregoing part of this Diſcourſe) but as the Meritorious cauſe of it, Jeſus Chriſt having by his Satisfaction procured our Pardon, and ſuch a Pardon, as doth effectually beſtead us inſtead of that other kind of Righteouſneſs, which conſiſts in a perfect conformity to the Law.

6. I have obſerved alſo, that as ſome Authors do call Pardon of ſin a *Legal righteouſneſs*; ſo Others, if not the ſame alſo, do ſtyle that other Righteouſneſs, which conſiſts in a perfect conformity to the Law, a *Legal Righteouſneſs:* and for this cauſe it behoves us, in matters of Controverſie ſpecially, intently to obſerve the meaning of what is written, and the mind of the Writer, leſt by miſtaking his true ſenſe we fall to ſtriſe about words, a thing to be deteſted, and with much care to be avoided. But for the warrant-

ing

ing of the term [*Legal*] as applied to both the said Righteousnesses, be it known, That those, who call Pardon of sin a *Legal Righteousness*, do take the word [*Legal*] *sensu forensi*, in a judiciary or Court-sense, they meaning thereby, that a Sinner pardoned shall in Judgment, and before Gods Tribunal be discharged, or legally acquitted, *i.e.* by the Law of the Gospel; and therefore do they call his Pardon a *Legal righteousness*, a person so discharged being *Rectus in Curiâ*, and in account of that Law righteous. On the other side it concerns us to know, that they who style our inherent qualitative Righteousness by the name of a *Legal righteousness* in way of contradiction to Pardon of sin, do take the word [*Legal*] *in sensu morali*, in an Ethical, or Moral sense; not in a Jural or Court-sense, and as Lawyers, but in a School-sense, and as Philosophers take the word, the word [*Legal*] being all one with them as Moral, and as corresponding to the Laws Precept in the Letter thereof: And thence it is sometimes styled by them a *Literal*, or *Text-righteousness*, the Text it self, or Letter of the Law, as the Rule of Duty, requiring it. Yet this I must needs say, That albeit Pardon of sin may in a well explained sense, as aforesaid, be called a *Legal righteousness*; yet conceive, that they who call the other kind of Righteousness, which is contrary to Pardon, a *Legal righteousness*, do express themselves in language more agreeable both to reason and to the Scriptures, wherein we read conformity to the Precepts of the Law styled by the Apostle δικαιοσύνη ἡ ἐν νόμῳ, a *Righteousness which is in the Law*, *Phil.3.6.* or *the Righteousness of the Law*; and Pardon of sin is styled a Righteousness

χωρὶς νόμου, *without the Law*, Rom. 3. 21. as I ſhall have occaſion to declare in one Chapter or another of this Diſcourſe, and wherein I ſhall intimate, by what diſtinguiſhing words or phraſes this imputed Righteouſneſs (*Forgiveneſs of ſin*) is held forth, or expreſſed in the Sacred Scriptures, and this will, in part at leaſt, be the Subject of the next Chapter.

Q. *By what diſtinguiſhing words is the ſaid Imputed Righteouſneſs ſtyled in Scripture?* Anſw. *It is ſtyled a Righouſneſs without works. Hereupon it being queſtioned, how, or in what ſenſe it is, or can be ſo ſaid to be (foraſmuch as the expreſſion, a Righteouſneſs without Works, is in ſound like the expreſſion, a Righteouſneſs without righteouſneſs) the Queſtion is anſwered more at large, 1. Negatively, 2. Affirmatively.*

Q. BY *what diſtinguiſhing Names, or phraſes is Forgiveneſs of ſin expreſſed in the Sacred Scriptures?*

Anſw. It is ſtyled by the Apoſtle St. *Paul*, a Righteouſneſs without Works, *Rom. 4. 6. Bleſſed is the man to whom God imputeth righteouſneſs without works.* Now what he means by this Righteouſneſs without works (for a Righteouſneſs without works ſounds like a contradiction) he doth plainly expreſs in the verſes immediately following, quoted from the *Pſalmiſt*, ſaying, *Bleſſed are*

are they whoſe iniquities are forgiven, and whoſe ſins are covered. Bleſſed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute ſin. I need not prove, that forgiveneſs of ſin is the thing it ſelf, or that very righteouſneſs without works, which is there ſaid to be imputed by God to believing ſinners; for, beſides that the Apoſtle doth preſently, ſo ſoon as the expreſſion had drop'd from his pen, interpret the matter (making forgiveneſs of ſin, or a non-imputation thereof, a deſcription of righteouſneſs without works) I have already more at large made proof of the ſame in the firſt Chapter of this ſecond Part of this Diſcourſe. The onely thing therefore that is here needful to be done, is to manifeſt the reaſon why S. *Paul* doth ſtyle forgiveneſs of ſin by a name ſo ſeemingly uncouth and ſtrange, (*a righteouſneſs without works*;) which words from the mouth of an ordinary Speaker would be thought to be of affinity with theſe, (*a righteouſneſs without righteouſneſs.*) The reaſon or reaſons hereof I will endeavour to manifeſt in anſwer to the following Queſtion.

Q. *How or in what ſenſe is it true to ſay, That forgiveneſs of ſin is a righteouſneſs without works? or upon what grounds or in what reſpects doth S. Paul ſo ſtyle it?*

Anſw. 1. Negatively: The reaſon is not becauſe no manner of work at all is to be done by ſinners, (Gods helping Grace inclining and enabling them thereunto) that this righteouſneſs may by God be imputed to them, or for the righteouſneſs ſake of Chriſt conferred upon them: this cannot be the reaſon; for nothing is more plain and evident by the current of Scripture, than that the work of Faith, of Re-

pentance and Converſion, is required of ſinners, and by the Law of Chriſt made abſolutely neceſſary in order to the forgiveneſs of their ſins, See *Luke* 13.3,5. & 24. 47. *Acts* 3.19. And it concerns us the rather to take heed of thinking, that pardon of ſin is ſtyled a righteouſneſs without works, as if no good work were to be done by ſinners, that they may be morally capable of having it for Chriſts ſake beſtowed upon them by God, becauſe ſuch an imagination is an error of moſt dangerous conſequence, yea ſo dangerous, as that ſhould it be practically entertained, a ſinner could not poſſibly be ſaved. As was ſaid by the Comedian concerning the Family of a proſuſe Spendthrift, *Ipſa ſi cupiat ſalus ſervare hanc familiam, prorſus non poteſt:* In like ſort may it be ſaid concerning ſuch ſinners, who imagining or preſuming as aforeſaid, do practiſe accordingly. The Saviour of the world (all things conſidered) cannot ſave ſuch ſinners, *i.e.* during ſuch. Onely I muſt ſay, that Gods Grace and Mercy is wonderful towards ſome Chriſtians of better Hearts than Heads, in preſerving them from living up to their unſound Opinions, which yet they are not contented to hold onely to themſelves, (like that private Faith ſpoken of by the Apoſtle, *Rom.* 14.21.) but do alſo openly hold forth in Preſs and Pulpit, and do zealouſly contend for (under pretence of Chriſts Sceptre Advanced) Chriſt alone Exalted, the Freedom of Grace, and Gratuitous Juſtification Vindicated; with the like ſpecious pretences prefixed as glorious Titles to their Books.

2. Affirmatively. Forgiveneſs of ſin may well and truly be ſtyled a righteouſneſs without works, becauſe no works at all of ours did pur-

chaſe

chaſe or procure the grant thereof, according to the Terms expreſſed in the Covenant of Grace, being the ſole Purchaſe of Chriſts own righteouſneſs, without any work of ours, yea without ſo much as a requeſt from our lips, Gods pardoning Covenant being granted without any Petition from Man, God in Chriſt having prevented Man with that bleſſing of his goodneſs.

2. It may be truly ſtyled a righteouſneſs without works, becauſe no work of ours doth *ingredi naturam rei, i. e.* is any ingredient into it, or any conſtituent cauſe of it, *i. e.* this kind of righteouſneſs doth not lie in or conſiſt of works done by us, it being wholly and ſolely the work of God done upon us, or a work of Divine Mercy exerciſed towards us; briefly, it being Gods bleſſing conferred upon us. I call this righteouſneſs a bleſſing, becauſe the Apoſtle not onely ſays, (*Bleſſed are they whoſe iniquities are forgiven*;) but he doth alſo ſtyle it μακαρισμὸς, v. 9. (cometh this bleſſedneſs on the Circumciſion onely——) and εὐλογία, a bleſſing, the bleſſing of *Abraham*, *Gal.* 3. 14. becauſe it is that wherewith God bleſſed believing *Abraham*. And it ſeems worthy of Obſervation, that herein lies a notable and grand difference betwixt the righteouſneſs of Sanctification and this of Juſtification, or remiſſion of ſin; in that the former is a righteouſneſs of works, made up of Mans works conſtituting the ſame (I muſt here be underſtood to mean Sanctification Actual, and not meerly Habitual;) whereas this other kind of righteouſneſs is of no ſuch complexion or conſtitution. For although the work of Faith, Repentance, and new Obedience, (in full purpoſe

of heart at leaſt) be an external requiſite unto it; nevertheleſs this righteouſneſs it ſelf is entirely the work of God, and conſiſteth in this acquitting or abſolving a ſinner from the guilt of his ſins, or (as the Apoſtles expreſſion is) it is Gods not imputing ſin to a believing ſinner; the ſaid Abſolution and Diſcharge, or non-imputation of ſin, being the very *formalis ratio*, the quiddity or eſſential nature of this imputed righteouſneſs, and to which Faith it ſelf is ſaid to be imputed, as will be afterwards declared: But although pardon of ſin may be truly ſtyled a righteouſneſs without works, for the reaſon in this Paragraph ſpecified: nevertheleſs I have not alledged it as the genuine reaſon, upon which S. *Paul* doth in the Text ſo ſtyle it: for Faith it ſelf doth not *ingredi naturam rei*, is no ingredient into remiſſion of ſin, or any conſtituent cauſe of it; and the Apoſtles intent in this Chapter is far from inſinuating a ſinners righteouſneſs or juſtification to be without Faith; yea his ſcope is to prove the contrary, *viz.* that Faith is imputed to us for, or unto this righteouſneſs. I will therefore alledge the following reaſon as that, which doth (I doubt not) directly and plainly ſuit with the mind and meaning of the Apoſtle.

3. S. *Paul* ſtyles pardon of ſin, or Goſpel juſtification, a righteouſneſs without works, in oppoſition to thoſe works, the neceſſity whereof to the ſalvation of ſinners was in thoſe days taught by the falſe Apoſtles; againſt which as not neceſſary to the juſtification of believing ſinners, he doth deſignedly argue in that and in other of his Epiſtles. So that the Apoſtle ſtyles it a righteouſneſs without works, becauſe there

are

are a certain ſort or ſorts of works, that are not at all by any ſtanding Law of God now required of ſinners, in order to the imputation of this righteouſneſs, *viz.* ſuch works as are oppoſite to the Faith of Chriſt Incarnate, (theſe being the works excluded by the Apoſtle in the foregoing verſes) and ſuch works as do (really or reputatively) make the reward to be of Debt, and not of Grace, as is manifeſt by the preceding v. 4, 5. *Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt; but to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that juſtifieth the ungodly, his faith* -- Now what theſe works ſo excluded by the Apoſtle are, I ſhall ſomewhat more diſtinctly ſpecifie in ſome other Chapter. In the mean while be it obſerved what works are not excluded, *viz.* not Faith in Chriſt, the work of Faith, or the works of Faith; for by *worketh not*, v. 5. we may not, ought not, cannot (agreeably to the analogy of Faith) underſtand the Apoſtle to have excluded all and every Chriſtian good work: as if he had ſaid, *To him that repenteth not, converteth not* —— For ſuch a conſtruction would make S. *Pauls* Doctrine not onely contrary to Chriſts and other his fellow Apoſtles, but would alſo ſet him at odds with himſelf, and that not onely in what he writes in other of his Epiſtles to other Churches, but alſo in this of his to the *Romans*, particularly chap. 8 13. *If ye live after the fleſh, ye ſhall die; but if ye through the Spirit do mortifie the deeds of the body, ye ſhall live.* And Chap. 2. 10. *Glory, honour, and peace to him that worketh good.* And Chap. 6. 16. where he expreſly ſpeaks of *obedience unto righteouſneſs*, intimating thereby the neceſſity of a Chriſtians ſincere obedience, in order to the partaking of that righteouſ-

neſs which I am now ſpeaking of.

Finally, forasmuch as that righteouſneſs which God is ſaid to impute to believing ſinners, *Rom.* 4. 6. is there ſtyled a righteouſneſs without works; I ſhall offer two things to the conſideration of thoſe, who do aſſert the imputation of Chriſts righteouſneſs it ſelf to Believers; and that this is the imputed righteouſneſs meant by the Apoſtle in that Scripture. I deſire them to conſider, how or in what ſenſe Chriſts righteouſneſs can be ſtyled a righteouſneſs without works: for is not Chriſts righteouſneſs a perfect legal righteouſneſs, made up of works, and conſiſting (his habitual righteouſneſs being ſuppoſed) in his fulfilling all righteouſneſs, to ſpeak in his own words, *Matth.* 3. 15.

2. How are thoſe capable of pardon of ſin, who have a perfect righteouſneſs of works imputed to them? or whether forgiveneſs of ſin and imputation of the ſaid perfect righteouſneſs be not utterly inconſiſtent? For if we are perfectly righteous with a righteouſneſs of works, whether in our perſons, or by imputation of that righteouſneſs of works wherewith Chriſt was righteous, we have (as I think) no need of forgiveneſs; and if we need forgiveneſs, it from hence follows, that God doth not impute the ſaid righteouſneſs of works unto us, accounting us thereupon perfectly righteous, and upon that account, or as ſuch, acquitting us; but that we are juſtified (for ſo indeed we are) as Malefactors by a Pardon purchaſed by the righteouſneſs of Chriſt.

CHAP.

CHAP VI.

Another diſtinguiſhing Phraſe, whereby the ſaid imparted or imputed righteouſneſs (forgiveneſs of ſin) expreſſed in the Writings of S. Paul, is a righteouſneſs of God, and without the Law, the Reaſons whereof are ſpecified in the Chapters immediately following.

Q. BY *what other diſtinguiſh'd Title or Titles is the ſaid imputed righteouſneſs (the non-imputation or remiſſion of ſin) ſtyled in Scripture?*

Anſw. It is ſtyled *A righteouſneſs of God without the Law, Rom.* 3. 21. *But now the righteouſneſs of God without the Law is manifeſted, being witneſſed by the Law and the Prophets.* By the righteouſneſs of God is not there meant that righteouſneſs of God wherewith he is righteous, or which denominates him righteous, (in which ſenſe it is taken in other verſes of this Chapter, ver. 5, 25, 26.) but a righteouſneſs wherewith (as the gift of God) we are righteous; which righteouſneſs here meant is that righteouſneſs which I am now ſpeaking of, and which doth conſiſt in a ſinners juſtification, or the remiſſion of his ſin, as doth appear by the following verſes, ver. 22, 29, 25, 26. *Even the righteouſneſs of God which is by faith of Jeſus Chriſt unto all and upon all that believe—— Being juſtified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Jeſus Chriſt, whom God hath ſet*

forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins, that are past through the forbearance of God. To declare, I say, at this time his righteousness, that he might be just and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus, τὸν ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ, as it is in the Original, which word for word being rendred is, *him who is of the faith of Jesus, i. e.* of the Christian Faith. There is a kind of righteousness, which in another Epistle S. *Paul* styles a righteousness ἐν νόμῳ, *in the Law*, and ἐκ νόμου, *of the Law*, ver. 9. and for distinctions sake, or in opposition thereunto he calls the righteousness which I am here speaking of, *the righteousness of God without the Law*, and *the righteousness of God which is by the faith of Jesus Christ*; by which righteousness of God, though I do interpret justification or remission of sin, (the righteousness promised in the Law of Faith) to be meant thereby: nevertheless I would not be understood as excluding, but as including that righteousness also, which in the Law of Faith is commanded, the said Phrases, (*the righteousness of God without the Law*, and *the righteousness of God which is by the faith of Jesus Christ*) being in my opinion comprehensive of both the said righteousnesses, as well of that which is commanded, as of that which is promised in the Law of Faith. As for this later phrase (*the righteousness of God, which is by the faith of Jesus Christ*) it being one of those Phrases, whereby the righteousness which I am now speaking of (Justification or Remission of sin) is expressed in Scripture, I will speak of it distinctly and more at large in a peculiar Chapter. In the mean while I will answer two or three Questions referring to the title in hand,

viz.

viz. Why is this imputed righteouſneſs (forgiveneſs of ſin) ſtyled the righteouſneſs of God? and, Why without the Law? The Anſwer to which Queſtions ſhall be the ſubject of the Chapters next enſuing.

CHAP. VII.

Q. *Why is the ſaid imputed righteouſneſs ſtyled the righteouſneſs of God? Anſwer hereunto, It is anſwered both Negatively and Affirmatively, What is, and What is not, the Reaſon thereof.*

Q. WHY *is this imputed righteouſneſs ſtyled the righteouſneſs of God?*

Anſw. Negatively, not becauſe it may not In any commodious or fitting ſenſe be truly ſtyled Mans own righteouſneſs: for this gift of Grace, or gift of righteouſneſs, (as the Apoſtle ſtyles it, *Rom.* 5. 15, 17.) is verily a mans own, and ſo to be accounted, as any other gifts of God are, that are by God freely and graciouſly beſtowed upon him. And in this righteouſneſs of his own a ſinner need not fear to appear before God, or at the judgment ſeat of Chriſt, no more than a Malefactor at the Bar with the Kings Pardon in his boſom: for though an ungodly or impenitent ſinner ſhall not ſtand in the judgment; nevertheleſs a penitent believer, being one of the congregation of the righteous,

teous, may assure himself that it shall then be well with him, and that he shall not come into condemnation, *Isa.* 3.10. *Joh.* 1.24. and this upon account (under Gods mercy in Christ) of his own righteousness.

2. Affirmatively, it is styled the righteousness of God in opposition to one kind of righteousness, which the Apostle styles our own righteousness, *Rom.*10.3. *They being ignorant of Gods righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves to the righteousness of God.* And in a like opposition to our own righteousness doth S. *Paul* call it *the righteousness which is of God, Phil.* 3 9. *Not having mine own righteousness, which is of the Law; but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith.* Where it is very considerable, what that righteousness is which S. *Paul* doth there style his own, and as such rejects even as loss and dung, that he might gain the righteousness of God, or that righteousness which is of God by Faith. Now that we may understand the Apostles meaning, he doth so far interpret himself, and the matter in hand, as to give a description of that his own righteousness, saying, τὴν ἐκ νόμου, which is of the Law; and which he styles ver. 6. τὴν ἐν νόμῳ, which is in the Law; which what this righteousness is, because it doth greatly concern us to know, I will therefore endeavour to manifest in answer to another Question, which will be the subject of the next Chapter.

CHAP.

CHAP. VIII.

Q. *What Law doth the Apostle mean in styling pardon of sin a righteousness without Law?* Answ. *In answer hereunto it is specified both what is and is not the reason thereof. A large explication of* Phil. 3. 9. *wherein is manifested what righteonsness that is, which he calls his own, and yet doth disown; and a vindication of the said Scripture from the misconstruction of divers Brethren.*

Q. WHat Law doth the Apostle mean, where speaking of his own rejected righteousness, he defines it to be a righteousness, which is of and in the Law?

Answ. This is a Question (as hath been already intimated) of great moment; and therefore I will answer to it more punctually, and that both negatively and affirmatively.

1. Negatively, he doth not mean the Law of the Gospel, and consequently by his own righteousness he doth not mean a righteousness conform thereunto, either that kind of righteousness which is promised in it, or commanded by it; neither of which is meant by the Apostle 'tis easie to demonstrate.

1. Then be it considered, that under the phrase (his own righteousness, which is in or of the Law) he doth not mean a righteousness promised

miſed in the Law of Chriſt, or Goſpel, is evident: for this righteouſneſs ſo promiſed is juſtification it ſelf, or remiſſion of ſin for the righteouſneſs ſake of Chriſt: and to renounce this is in effect to have renounced his part in Paradiſe, and the Kingdom of Heaven, or the Crown of Life, as dung.

2. Nor was the renouncing of this his Evangelical righteouſneſs the way to win Chriſt, make what conſtruction we will or can of that phraſe; which if conſtrued (as well it may) of the favour of Chriſt, and thoſe high privileges that come by Chriſt, it may be truly ſaid, that the Apoſtle in renouncing his Evangelical righteouſneſs promiſed in the Goſpel, had renounced pardon of ſin, and juſtification by Chriſt; for even this is that high favour and privilege, (that favour of favours, that privilege of privileges, that mercy of mercies) that is promiſed by Chriſt in his Law of Grace to all penitent Believers.

2. That by his own righteouſneſs, which is in or of the Law, the Apoſtle doth not mean that righteouſneſs which is commanded by the Law of the Goſpel, is no leſs evident than the former: for, 1. The righteouſneſs there commanded is believing in Chriſt, love to Chriſt, repentance for ſin, in a word obedience to Chriſt. 2. This righteouſneſs is not onely commanded in the Goſpel as matter of duty, but it is thereby conſtituted the condition of enjoying that other kind of righteouſneſs which is therein promiſed.

3. Conſequently, to ſlight the having of this righteouſneſs, or to renounce this, is interpretatively to renounce the other; (even as to deſpiſe

ſpiſe the means, is conſtructively to deſpiſe the end;) for it is ſo far from being the way to win Chriſt, *i. e.* his favour, as that the neglect of that Evangelical righteouſneſs is the direct way to miſs or loſe Chriſt and his favour; God having in his Word of Life (the Goſpel of our Salvation) entailed the righteouſneſs therein promiſed upon the peformance of the righteouſneſs therein preſcribed, as the Condition thereof.

4. Conſider the words of that verſe 10. *That I may know him and the power of his reſurrection, and the fellowſhip of his ſufferings, being made conformable to his death.* In which two things to my purpoſe in hand are conſiderable: 1. That by the knowledge of Chriſt, the power of his reſurrection, the fellowſhip of his ſufferings, and conformity to his death, is meant that Evangelical righteouſneſs, conſiſting in a Chriſtians both active and paſſive obedience, which is commanded by Chriſt in the Goſpel Law, in order to the enjoyment of the righteouſneſs therein promiſed by him.

2. Conſider that the Apoſtle was ſo far from renouncing that branch of his Evangelical righteouſneſs as loſs and dung, as that he doth highly value it, and ſo highly prize it, and the excellency thereof, as to ſuffer the loſs of all things that ſtood in competition with it, and to account them as dung, ver. 8.

3. Yea thirdly, from the verſe and verſes immediately following it is conſiderable what the reaſon was, why S. *Paul* did not renounce, but incomparably prize, that his Evangelical righteouſneſs, *viz.* Becauſe he well knew,

1. That

1. That without this righteouſneſs he could not be found in Chriſt, *i.e.* be a true member of Chriſts body. Where note, that S. *Paul* ſays not, that I may be found in his righteouſneſs, much leſs in his righteouſneſs imputed to him; but ſimply in him, in Chriſt himſelf, this being the deſcription of the ſpiritual eſtate of a Believer oft times in the New Teſtament, he there being ſaid to be one in Chriſt, *Rom.* 8.1. & 16.7.

2. The Apoſtle knew full well, that there was no winning of Chriſt without that his Evangelical righteouſneſs, and that this was the meanes by God appointed for the winning of him: for, ſays he ver. 15. *If by any means I might attain to the reſurrection of the dead.* To attain to the reſurrection of the dead, is in the language of the Apoſtle elſewhere to obtain a better, *i.e.* a moſt bleſſed reſurrection at the laſt day, *Heb.* 11.35. or in the language uſed by him in the 14 ver. of this chapter, it is to obtain that, which in alluſion to the Olympick Games (a thing frequent in the Writings of this Apoſtle) he ſtyles *the prize of the high calling of God in Chriſt Jeſus, i. e.* of our Chriſtian calling. Now to attain to this, or to obtain this, what is it in effect, or true conſtruction of the Apoſtles meaning; but to win or gain Chriſt, whom we cannot be ſaid in the moſt full and complete ſenſe to have won, till we have ſo attained or obtained? And that the purſuing of the ſaid Evangelical righteouſneſs was the means of attaining the ſaid price, appears by his ſaying, Εἴπως, *If by any means I may attain unto the reſurrection of the dead.* Which becauſe as yet to that time he had not (confeſſedly ver. 12.) attained, he acquaints us therefore with his preſent and conſtant purſuit of the means,

ſay-

saying ver. 12, 13. *I follow after, if that I may apprehend* ..... And this his practice in the constant pursuit of the means of winning Christ, of attaining or obtaining the prize at last, he exhorts the *Philippians*, and in them all Christians, to imitate, saying, *Let us therefore, as many as be perfect, be thus minded:* and ver. 17. *Brethren, be followers together of me, and mark them which so walk as* ..... The righteousness which S. *Paul* did there renounce, he doth express in one repeated word (*flesh*, ver. 3, 4.) the meaning of which word he doth presently interpret, ver. 5, 6. he meaning thereby his Pedigree, as a perfect Jew by Descent, Pharisaism, Circumcision, and the Observation of all that Law, to which Circumcision did oblige him, *i. e.* the Mosaical Law; for *Gal.* 5. 3. by Circumcision a person became a debtor to that whole Law.

2. Having been so copious in the Negative branch of my Answer to the Question in hand, I shall now answer thereunto Affirmatively, *viz.* That by the Law in those words, (*not having mine own righteousness, which is in or of the Law*) the Apostle means the Mosaical or Ceremonial Law, that Law which was peculiar to the Jews, and therefore by us commonly styled the Judaical Law. In this sense the word Law is frequently taken in the Writings of this Apostle, especially in his Epistles to the *Romans* and *Galatians*, wherein he doth purposely argue against the necessity of the works of that Law, and the obligingness thereof. See *Rom.* 3. 21, 28. & 7. 4. *Gal.* 4 5. & 3. 23. & 4. 21. And that the word Law is thus to be taken in the place under debate, doth manifestly appear by the precedent verses (ver. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6.) and by the scope of the

A-

Apoſtle therein, which was to arm the *Philippians* againſt the inſinuations of ſuch dividing Teachers, who maintained Judaiſm, eſpecially Circumciſion, to be neceſſary to the Salvation of a ſinner. Now this righteouſneſs of the Judaical Law S. *Paul* calls his own righteouſneſs, becauſe it was not at that time a righteouſneſs of God, or any branch of righteouſneſs commanded by him as then to continue in force, or *in ſtatu quo prius*. True, time was when it might have been ſtyled a righteouſneſs of God, becauſe it was commanded by God in his Law, (ſtyled *the Law of commandments*, Eph. 2. 15.) and promiſes by God were made thereunto, *Rom.* 9. 4. but that Law by the death of Chriſt being aboliſhed, a righteouſneſs conformable thereunto was no longer a righteouſneſs of God, but purely their own: it was indeed ἐθελοθρησκεία, (to uſe the Apoſtles word, *Col.* 2. 23.) *Will-worſhip*, not *Gods worſhip*.

2. If any one ſhall adde to that Anſwer, ſaying, That by Law may alſo poſſibly be meant the Law of works, or innocency as given to *Adam* in Paradiſe, the truth thereof is not to be denied: for,

1. A righteouſneſs conformable to this Law no fleſh living could be found in, all having ſinned, and come ſhort of the glory of God, the Scriptures having concluded all under ſin, as ſays the Apoſtle, *Rom.* 3. 19, 23.

2. Even the righteouſneſs which is of or in this Law, although it cannot be denied (ſpeaking ſimply) to be a righteouſneſs of God; nevertheleſs it may in ſome reſpect be denied ſo to be, *i. e.* reſpectively to the juſtification or ſalvation of lapſed man as the end thereof: for

per-

perfect righteousness conformable to that Law is not now commanded of God as the condition of a sinners justification and salvation, that Law as a covenant of works being now abolished, repealed, abrogated, (as some use to express the matter; or as others) relaxed and dispensed with, or (as others chuse to express the thing) ceased. Where by the way be it observed, how most intolerably it is said by Mr. *Ferguson*, (of which I spake somewhat, but too too sparingly, and as some perhaps will say over mildly; for that saying of Mr. *Fergusons* doth in the consequence thereof subvert the Gospel of Christ, the saying being understood according to the sound and most obvious sense or meaning thereof; in the former part of this Discourse, chap. 8. p. 34.) that notwithstanding the introduction of the Law of Faith, the Law of Perfect Obedience doth remain still in force: for although this Law being now become the Law of lapsed Nature, doth in some respect remain in force, *i. e.* doth continue still as a Precept obliging to future perfect obedience, and makes punishment due for all future disobedience; nevertheless upon the main, or to speak simply, it is utterly to be denied, that this Law doth to lapsed Nature still remain in force; for,

1. The promissory part with its condition is expired, *cessante capacitate subjecti*, as Casuists say of the Obligation of an Oath, that it ceaseth, *cessante materiâ juramenti*.

2. The preceptive part thereof is now ceased:

1. As it commanded absolute innocency, both actual and habitual, as well in habit as in act.

2. As it commanded the seeking of the reward (the justification of Life) on the condition, and by the means of perfect personal innocency. I have suggested these things as an Antidote, whereby to prevent the evil of Mr. *Fergusons* intolerable saying.

3. But to return, that by Law in the Text aforesaid may very well and truly be meant the Law of works, is manifest by this reason, *viz.* Because a righteousness conformable to the Law of works is incompossible and utterly inconsistent with that righteousness which S. *Paul* (a convinced sinner) and every man being a sinner, is by Jesus Christ, and through his bloudshed, to seek after, *i. e.* forgiveness of sin: for where there is no sin, there is no place for pardon: that which is not, cannot be pardoned. And forgiveness of sin may very well therefore be styled by the Apostle a righteousness without works, (as hath been said in the 5. chap. of this Discourse 3) because it is a righteousness altogether without the works of this Law, *i. e.* works exactly thereunto conformable; for as much as such works are incompetible with remission of sin, there being in that case no sin to be remitted. And some of the Apostles Arguments against justification by works do directly and forcibly conclude against the works of this Law, these making the reward to be of debt, and not of grace; and also making a sinners blessedness to be another manner of blessedness than *David* spake of, *i. e.* a blessedness not consisting in remission of sin.

I have been the larger in answering the Question touching the righteousness which S. *Paul* calls his own righteousness, which is in and of the

the Law; becauſe what hath been ſaid may ſerve to rectifie the common miſtake of the true mind and meaning of the Apoſtle in that Scripture; the miſtake particularly not onely of Dr. *Owen* and Dr. *Grew* mentioned in the foregoing part of this Treatiſe, but alſo of the Author, whom ſince the printing thereof I lately read, (ſtyled *Anti-ſozzo*, whom Mr. *Baxter* in the detection of ſeveral his Errors doth ſtyle a perſon of great wit and piety) who would perſuade us, that by Law is there meant any Law indefinite; and that by the righteouſneſs of Law is there meant that righteouſneſs which any Law urges, preſſes, and preſcribes, p. 547. and he purſues this his mis-interpretation in many pages, to which it were no difficult work punctually to make a ſatisfactory Reply, and I would do it here, were it not *actum agere*, and that I have ſaid already what is ſufficient for the ſatisfaction of any of my Diſſenting Brethren, as to the true ſenſe and meaning of the Apoſtle in that Scripture. I ſhall now proceed to intimate ſome further reaſon or reaſons, why the ſaid imputed righteouſneſs is ſtyled the righteouſneſs of God: but having ſo amplified the firſt reaſon, (he ſo ſtyling it in oppoſition to his own righteouſneſs, which is in and of the Law) I will be ſo much briefer in the reſt. Onely let me adde this to that which was before ſaid, *viz.* That by his own righteouſneſs, which is in the Law, the Apoſtle doth not onely mean that righteouſneſs, which (when time was) was commanded by God in the Judaical Law, but alſo all thoſe Privileges and Prerogatives, that therein were promiſed to the Obſervers thereof. This, I doubt not is one part of the Apoſtles mean-

ing comprized in that his Expreſſion, *mine own righteouſneſs which is of the Law.*

CHAP. IX.

Further Reaſons added to thoſe in Chapter VII. Why the ſaid Righteouſneſs is ſtyled the Righteouſneſs of God: wherein it is commended to obſervation, that there is a twofold righteouſneſs mentioned in Scripture, one which is ſo our own, as that it may and muſt be called the Righteouſneſs of God; and another which is ſo our own, as that it may not, ought not, to be ſtyled the Righteouſneſs of God: and what theſe two kinds of Righteouſneſs are, is plainly ſpecified. Whence it is inferred, that Jeſus Chriſt did not, in reference to the juſtification of a ſinner, keep the Law in his ſtead.

THE ſaid imputed righteouſneſs (the non-imputation or forgiveneſs of ſin) is ſtyled the righteouſneſs of God, becauſe as God doth promiſe it to us, ſo it is he who doth actually impute it unto, or beſtow it upon us, even as the Apoſtle ſays from the Pſalmiſt, *Rom.*4.6. (*As David deſcribes the bleſſedneſs of the man, unto whom God*

God imputeth righteouſneſs———) And Jeſus Chriſt being the meritorious cauſe of this righteouſneſs, he is ſaid to be of God made unto us righteouſneſs, *i.e.* made ſuch unto us cauſally, *i.e.* made to us of God the cauſe of righteouſneſs, 1 *Cor.* 1.30. And thence it is that this righteouſneſs is ſtyled *juſtitia ex Deo*, a righteouſneſs which is of God, *Phil.* 3.9. and the gift of righteouſneſs, *Rom.* 5.17. *i. e.* a gift of Gods free grace through Chriſt, ver. 16. And thence it is that thoſe who are made righteous by Gods pardoning or not imputing their treſpaſſes unto them, are ſaid to be made the righteouſneſs of God in Chriſt, 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. the abſtract (*righteouſneſs*) being put for the concrete (*righteous*) as is frequent in Scripture, *circumciſion* for *circumciſed*, *Phil.* 3.3. and *uncircumciſion* for *uncircumciſed*, *Rom* 2.26. *Ye are made the righteouſneſs of God in Chriſt*, *i.e.* by God through Chriſt, he not imputing your treſpaſſes unto you, ye are made very righteous.

1. Poſſibly it may be ſtyled the righteouſneſs of God, becauſe it is that which God will own and countenance, and which will bear a man out before God, and bring a ſinner off before Gods Tribunal as clear from guilt, *i. e.* guilt of puniſhment, as if he were perfectly righteous, with a righteouſneſs of his own wrought by himſelf in perſon, according to that celebrated ſaying of one of the Ancients, which oft times I have ſeen quoted in Authors, *Omnia mandata Dei facta deputantur, quando quicquid non fit, ignoſcitur: It is in Gods account, as if all his commandments had been kept and done by us, when whatſoever hath not been done is forgiven us.* At the cloſe of my Anſwer to the Queſtion, (Why the ſaid imputed

righteouſneſs is ſtyled the righteouſneſs of God?) and in anſwer whereunto it hath been declared, that it is ſo ſtyled by the Apoſtle in oppoſition to that which he calls his own, and what that righteouſneſs is which he ſtyles his own, having been alſo amply declared, I deſire the intelligent Reader to obſerve from the premiſſes, that there is a twofold righteouſneſs mentioned in the Scriptures, *viz.* one that is ſo our own, as that it may and muſt be ſtyled the righteouſneſs of God; and of this ſort is a ſinners Evangelical righteouſneſs, I mean, both that which was commanded by, and that alſo which is promiſed in the Law, or Goſpel of Chriſt, *viz.* holineſs of life and remiſſion of ſin. Theſe truly are a mans own righteouſneſs, and yet are the righteouſneſs of God, and ſo ſtyled in Sacred Writ.

2. There is another kind of righteouſneſs, which is ſo our own, as that it may not, ought not, cannot be ſtyled the righteouſneſs of God, but muſt be denied to be ſuch, either ſimply or reſpectively at leaſt, *e. g.* a righteouſneſs conformed to the Judaical Law is ſimply to be denied to be a righteouſneſs of God, the Law it ſelf formerly requiring it being now expired; and a righteouſneſs conformed to the Law or Covenant of works, being alſo reſpectively to be denied to be a righteouſneſs of God, *i.e.* reſpectively to the juſtification or ſalvation of Man now in his lapſed eſtate: for although it once was a righteouſneſs of God, with reſpect to the juſtification of Man innocent; yet now it is not ſo with reſpect to the juſtification of Man in his lapſed condition, it being now not commanded of God for any ſuch end or purpoſe,

as

as hath been plainly declared in the foregoing Chapter. Whence by the way be it obſerved, how groundleſſy it is ſaid by too too many Brethren, that Jeſus Chriſt in reference to our juſtification did keep the Law in our ſtead. It may be truly ſaid I readily acknowledge, that Chriſt did keep the Law for us, that we might be juſtified, *i.e.* pardoned, or not condemned for our breaches thereof: but it is falſe to ſay, that he fulfilled the Law in our ſtead, that we might be juſtified as fulfillers thereof in or by him; for this ſenſe of the word (*inſtead*) doth pregnantly import, that the fulfilling of the Law was primarily required of every man ſince the Fall for his juſtification, and that God in regard of the perſonal diſability of mankind for the fulfilling thereof for ſuch an end, did ſend his Son Jeſus Chriſt to fulfill it in their room and place: which Suppoſition is a manifeſt and notorious untruth; for,

1. Man having once broken the Law, is become from thence forward a Subject naturally uncapable of being juſtified by any future obedience to it, although he ſhould perfectly keep it to the worlds end.

2, God hath ſince the Fall of Man opened another way (a new and living way, to ſpeak in the language of the Apoſtle, *Heb.* 10.19.) for the juſtification of ſinners, yea for their juſtification of another kind, *i.e.* for their juſtification from the guilt of puniſhment contracted by their ſin, and this by Faith in Jeſus Chriſt. So that to aſſert (as many do, who have gotten to themſelves, whether deſignedly or by hap, the prime name of Goſpel Preachers with the Vulgar both in City and Country) that the fulfilling of the Law is required of any man now in his

lapsed estate, whether by himself or by any other in his stead, is in the consequence thereof to subvert the Gospel of Christ, and in effect to preach another Gospel than we have received from him and his Apostles; the embracing whereof by too too many is yet the less to be marvelled at, seeing there were those, even in the primitive times, while the Apostles of our Saviour were alive, who were soon removed unto another Gospel, *Gal.* 1. 6.

Again, be it considered whether this Assertion (that Christ hath fulfilled all the righteousness of the Law in our stead for our justification) doth not overthrow their grand Gospel Doctrine, (as it is mis-called) of a sinners justification by the imputation of Christs righteousness, which they usually affirm to be one integral part of justification; for if he did it in our stead, it seems to become ours *ipso facto* without an imputation. If we suppose that Christ did undertake, and that God did accept of Christ to be our surety and Mediator to act in our stead, what needs any imputation to make it ours? Would not his righteousness become ours by his bare precise acting in our stead; even as whatsoever is done by our Proxy appointed and allowed to act for us, becomes ours immediately even in strictness of Law, and without any imputation of grace to make it so?

CHAP.

CHAP. X.

Q. Why is the ſaid imparted or imputed righteouſneſs of God ſtyled a righteouſneſs without the Law? Anſw. The Queſtion is anſwered, 1. Negatively, What is not: 2. Affirmatively, What are the Reaſons thereof.

Q. *WHY is the ſaid imputed righteouſneſs (the non-imputation or remiſſion of ſin) ſtyled a righteouſneſs of God without Law, a Law, or the Law? For a righteouſneſs without a Law ſounds alike harſhly as a righteouſneſs without works.*

Anſw. The Queſtion being of moment, I will therefore make anſwer to it as I have done to many others, both Negatively and Affirmatively.

1. Negatively, not becauſe it is univerſally without any manner of Law whatſoever: for,

1. Without all manner of Law whatſoever there can be no manner of righteouſneſs at all; for all righteouſneſs hath reference to one Law or other, as the rule thereof, the Law being the rule both of Duty and of Judgment. As, *Where there is no Law, there is no tranſgreſſion, Rom.* 4. 14. no unrighteouſneſs, ſo nor righteouſneſs. There is not any thing that can deſerve the name of righteouſneſs, much leſs the righteouſneſs of God, which is abſolutely and univerſally without any Law.

2. This

2. This imputed righteouſneſs accrues, is conveyed to us, or comes upon us (as is the frequent language of the Apoſtle in his Epiſtle both to the *Romans* and *Galatians*) by Law, even that Law which for diſtinctions ſake is called the Law of Faith, *Rom.*3.27. As there are two ſorts or integral parts of our Evangelical righteouſneſs, which are ſo our own, as that withall they are in Scripture ſaid to be the righteouſneſs of God; ſo neither of them are ſimply without Law, but both of them are indeed according to Law, *i. e.* the Law of Faith, or of the Goſpel, the one kind of righteouſneſs, as a ſinners duty being thereby commanded, and the other as Gods merciful favour and divine bleſſing being therein promiſed.

2. I anſwer Affirmatively:

1. It is called a righteouſneſs without Law for the ſame reaſon as it is called a righteouſneſs without works, theſe Phraſes (without Law, without works, without the works of the Law) being equivalent and of promiſcuous uſe with this Apoſtle in ſeveral places of his Writings, wherein there are many things hard to be underſtood, and very dangerous being miſunderſtood; ſo that the Apoſtle by (without the Law) doth mean without the works of the Law, there being an elegant *Antanaclaſis* in the word Law repeated, *Rom.* 3.21. and there uſed in a different ſenſe; for whereas in the later part of that verſe it is taken for the Books of *Moſes*, in the firſt part it is taken for the Works of the Law; S. *Paul* herein being his own Interpreter, ſaying ver. 18. *Therefore we conclude, that a man is juſtified by faith without the deeds of the Law.*

2. S.

2. S. *Paul* ſtyles it a righteouſneſs without the Law, in oppoſition to that which in other places he ſtyles a righteouſneſs which is of the Law, *Phil.*3.9. and a righteouſneſs which is *ex lege*, by the Law, *Gal.*3.21. *If there had been a Law given, that could have given life, verily righteouſneſs ſhould have been by the Law.* See the ſame oppoſition *Rom.*10.3. with ver.5. *Moſes* deſcribeth the righteouſneſs which is ἐκ νόμου, of, from, or by Law, or the Law. And if the queſtion be demanded, What Law is it that is meant in that forecited ſaying of the Apoſtle, *Rom.* 3.21. *The righteouſneſs of God without the Law.* I anſwer, in the ſame reſtrained ſenſe as the word Law is to be taken in thoſe ſayings of his, *Phil.*3.9. wherein he ſpeaks of a righteouſneſs which is of the Law, *i.e.* it is truly to be underſtood, as hath been already ſaid, chap.8. of that Law which is oppoſite to the Law of faith, or belief of Chriſt incarnate, *viz.* concerning the Judaical Law, and the law of works, *i.e.* the law of innocency, this being moſt frequently in the Writings of modern Authors ſtyled the law of works.

1. When S. *Paul* ſtyles our imputed righteouſneſs (the non-imputation of ſin) a righteouſneſs without law, by that law truly is excluded the law or covenant of works: for,

1. This law hath no promiſe of pardon of ſin, nor affords any ground of hope of pardon to ſinners.

2. The works of this law are incompatible with forgiveneſs. He that is righteous according to this law, is not in a natural capacity of pardon, and he is juſtified by, or with another kind of righteouſneſs than this imputed righteouſneſs or forgiveneſs of ſin.

3. His

3. His juſtification is of debt, and not of grace, as hath been before inſinuated.

2. When S. *Paul* ſtyles the ſaid righteouſneſs a righteouſneſs without law, or the law, he doth directly mean the Judaical law, as hath been already ſaid chap. 8. that law, for the continued obligation or neceſſary obſervation whereof, not onely the unbelieving, but alſo thouſands of the believing Jews, were blindly zealous, and not according to that knowledge, which by the light of the Goſpel was afforded to them, as appears *Acts* 21. 20. *Rom.* 10. *beg.* yea ſo zealous, as to think they did God ſervice in perſecuting the Apoſtles, and other orthodox Chriſtians, for their non-compliance with them in adhering to the Moſaical law. I need not prove that this law is the law deſignedly and directly excluded by the Apoſtle in thoſe words of his *(without the Law:)* for,

1. The occaſion and ſcope of ſeveral the Apoſtles Epiſtles to the *Romans*, *Galatians*, and the *Hebrews*, is ſo well known, as that it cannot rationally be doubted of by any man, it being to take them off from adhering to that Law.

2. If we take Faith or believing in Chriſt in that ſenſe, wherein the Apoſtle ſpeaks of it, *viz.* for believing in the Meſſias as already come in the fleſh; ſo faith in Chriſt is inconſiſtent with that Law and the Works thereof. For, to uphold or adhere to that Law and the Works thereof, is by conſequence to deny that Jeſus Chriſt is come in the fleſh, or to deny the Faith of Chriſt Incarnate; for as much as that Law, and the Works thereof, were but a ſhadow of good things to come, *Coloſſ.* 2. 17. *Hebr.* 10. 1, Whereupon the retaining of them was virtually

tually or in Works to deny, that those good things (the Body) were already come.

I shall instance in another Scriptural Phrase, vvhereby the said imputed righteousnes is expressed, and this shall be the subject of the next Chapter.

CHAP.

CHAP. XI.

Another Scriptural Title given to remiſſion of ſin is, in its being ſtyled the righteouſneſs which is of, by, from, and thorough Faith; divers Reaſons whereof are rendred. The Authors Opinion touching the pardonableneſs of ſin, or placability of God in the queſtion, Whether this was any part of the τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, i. e. A thing diſcoverable by the light of Nature.

THE ſaid imputed righteouſneſs (the non-imputation or forgiveneſs of ſin) is ſtyled the righteouſneſs which is of Faith. Thus in two places, *Rom.* 9.30. *The Gentiles, which followed not after righteouſneſs, have attained to righteouſneſs, even the righteouſneſs which is of Faith.* And *Rom.* 10.6. *But the righteouſneſs which is of faith ſaith on this wiſe* —— And *Rom.* 3. 22. it is ſtyled, *the righteouſneſs of God which is by faith of Jeſus Chriſt.* And *Phil* 3.9. *A righteouſneſs which is thorough the faith of Chriſt, the righteouſneſs which is of God by faith.* In which places before cited the Apoſtle doth not uſe one and the ſame Greek Prepoſition, but various, ſaying, δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐκ πίστεως, *Rom.* 9.30. διὰ πίστεως, and ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει, of, from, by, or thorough faith, the faith of Chriſt. Whence obſerve by the way, that the righteouſneſs which is by God imputed

to

to ſinners, is not Chriſts righteouſneſs it ſelf; for if ſo, the Apoſtle would have ſaid ſo, even the righteouſneſs of Jeſus Chriſt himſelf, or Chriſts own righteouſneſs; whereas he ſays once and again, yea four times over, the righteouſneſs which is of, by, from, or through faith, the faith of Chriſt.

Q. *Why is the ſaid righteouſneſs ſtyled the righteouſneſs which is of, by, from, or through faith, the faith of Jeſus Chriſt?*

Anſw. 1. It is ſo ſtyled in oppoſition unto that kind of righteouſneſs which the Apoſtle doth oft times, and ſometimes in the ſelf ſame verſe, ſtyle a righteouſneſs of the Law, it not reſulting from, or being obtained by the obſervation of the Law, but by faith in Chriſt. This oppoſition we read expreſly in ſeveral Scriptures, *Phil.* 3.9. *Not having mine own righteouſneſs, which is of the Law, but that which is through the faith of Chriſt.* Thus alſo *Rom.* 3.21. with v.22. and *Rom.* 9.30. where having aſſerted the Gentiles, who followed not after righteouſneſs, to have attained to righteouſneſs, even the righteouſneſs which is of faith, he doth in the verſe following oppoſe it to another kind of righteouſneſs, ſaying, *But Iſrael which followed after the Law of righteouſneſs, hath not attained to the Law of righteouſneſs.* Where by the Law of righteouſneſs, which *Iſrael* is ſaid not to have attained to, is meant the righteouſneſs of the Law, there being in that ſaying the Figure called by Rhetoricians *Hypallage.*

Now from the ſaid oppoſition we may, as I think, unerringly conclude what manner of Works the Apoſtle doth mean in any of his Writings, wherein he oppoſeth Faith and Works,

viz.

viz. not all manner of Works whatſoever, but Works of Law, (for ſo it may be rendred out of the Original, the Article ϒ therein being wanting or not expreſſed, *Rom.* 3.28. and 9 31.) a law, the law, *i. e.* Works not conſiſtent with, but oppoſite unto, the Faith of Chriſt Incarnate, or Works of law (any law whatſoever) oppoſite to the law of Faith. Now what that law or laws are, and what thoſe Works are, which are inconſiſtent with, or oppoſite thereunto, hath been at large declared in the foregoing Chapter.

2. It is called the righteouſneſs of God, which is by Faith of Jeſus Chriſt, becauſe God in his law hath conſtituted Faith in Chriſt to be the condition of a ſinners enjoying this righteouſneſs, which law is for this reaſon ſtyled the law of Faith, *Rom.* 3.27. I need not bring Scriptures to prove the ſaid legal Conſtitution. As S. *Paul* tells us, that this righteouſneſs was witneſſed by the Law and the Prophets, *Rom.* 3. 21. ſo S. *Peter* tells us, that all the Prophets did witneſs faith in Chriſt to be the condition of enjoying it, *Acts* 10. 43. *To him give all the Prophets witneſs, that through his name whoſoever believeth in him ſhall receive remiſſion of ſin.* And thence it is that faith is ſaid to be imputed to us to this righteouſneſs, as hereafter will be ſaid at large, becauſe it is the Condition of enjoying it.

3. Conſequently becauſe it is through the faith of Chriſt that we are to ſeek and follow after this righteouſneſs, if ever we mean to attain it. For the reaſon of attaining and not attaining it, the Apoſtle ſhews to be the ſeeking and following after it in a right and wrong way, *i. e.* by faith and not by faith, *Rom.* 9.30,31,32.

4. Be-

4. Becauſe it is through faith to be expected, and as to the completion thereof waited for, *Gal* 5.5. *We through the ſpirit wait for hope of righteouſneſs, i.e.* righteouſneſs hoped for by faith.

5. Conſequently becauſe it comes upon us, or is actually derived to us upon our believing in Chriſt, or faith in him, according to that of the Apoſtle, with many other ſuch ſayings in Scripture, *Rom.* 10.10. *With the heart man believeth unto righteouſneſs.*

6. As for the foreſaid Reaſons it is ſtyled the righteouſneſs which is by faith, (faith being taken for *fides quâ*, the grace of faith, whereby or wherewith we believe;) ſo if we take faith for *fides quæ creditur*, the object of faith or thing believed, I anſwer to the queſtion ſo intended, that it is ſtyled the righteouſneſs which is by faith of Jeſus Chriſt, becauſe it is the Goſpel of Chriſt, (the word of faith, as it is ſtyled *Rom.* 10.8.) that doth reveal this righteouſneſs to be through Chriſt, and through faith in him; according to that of the Apoſtle, *Rom.* 1. where having mentioned the Goſpel, ver. 16. *As the mighty power of God through faith to ſalvation*; he adds ſaying ver. 17. *Therein is revealed the righteouſneſs of God, from faith to faith.* I cannot deny that Gods placability or merciful nature, in his readineſs to pardon penitent ſinners, is a branch of the τὸ χρηστὸν τ Θεῦ, one of thoſe things which was revealed to the Heathen by the light of Nature, and experience of Gods Providential Diſpenſations, Gods patience and longſuffering being of a native tendency, in it ſelf apt to lead all ſinners (the Gentiles as well as the Jews) to repentance, *Rom.* 2.4.

Again, if Gods placability had not been made known to the Heathen World, they would (as I think) undoubtedly never have sought by any means or sacrifices whatsoever, whether of the flesh of Beasts or Men, bad men or good men, the best or worst of men, to have appeased God, whom they were so sensible they had provoked. But although I cannot deny, as aforesaid, nevertheless that this righteousness of pardon was purchased, or to be purchased by Christ, or to come upon us through faith in him, whereupon justly to be styled a righteousness which is through faith in Christ; this they did not know by any light which they had, nor could it be known by any without supernatural revelation. Yea this is that which was but darkly, and not so clearly made known to the Jews themselves by the Scriptures of the Old Testament, to which purpose the Apostle speaks in several of his Epistles, *Rom.* 16. 25, 26. 2 *Tim.* 1. 10. And for this cause I do concur with that which Dr. *Owen* doth frequently assert in his Book styled *Communion with God, viz.* that the Scripture reveals no pardon of sin, but by and through Christ, and faith in him. And I do absolutely presume, that if we speak of Gospel pardon, and according to that description which the Doctor gives of it, saying p. 91. *Pardoning mercy is Gods free gracious acceptance of a sinner upon satisfaction made to his justice in the blood of Jesus.* *Amyraut* himself, yea every Christian, who confesseth satisfaction made by the bloud of Christ to the justice of God, will acknowledge with the Doctor, that the discovery of this pardoning mercy is not in the least glimpse discovered by the light of Nature, but solely by the Scriptures.

Yea

Yea the Socinians themſelves, who although they deny pardon of ſin to be upon ſatisfaction made to Divine Juſtice by the Blood of Jeſus; yet foraſmuch as they do not deny it to be in and through Chriſt, they alſo will concur in aſſerting, that pardon of ſin in, by, and through Chriſt, is not diſcoverable by any other light, than that of Scripture. But if we ſpeak of Gods pardoning mercy indefinitely, (not ſo and ſo circumſtantiated as in the Doctors deſcription) I muſt ſay again as before, *viz.* that I cannot deny, but that the Heathen World had ſome glimpſe thereof, and that they did know, (however imperfectly, and who can ſay but that they might have known it more perfectly?) *viz.* that there was pardoning mercy with God, that he might be feared.

CHAP. XII.

Q. *Whether doth a Sinner need ought more than the righteouſneſs of Chriſt to juſtifie him in the ſight of God?* Anſw. *Yes. The Authors profeſſed Diſſent as from certain other Brethren, ſo in ſpecial from* Dr. Grew, *late of* Coventry, *wherein is manifeſted, that although a Sinner needs nothing of the ſame kind more than Chriſts righteouſneſs to the ſaid end,* i. e. In genere cauſæ meritoriæ, *as a meritorious cauſe; nevertheleſs* (ſimpliciter loquendo, *to ſpeak the truth abſolutely*) *he needs many things, and thoſe of ſeveral kinds, to juſtifie him before God; and what thoſe things are is ſpecified at large.*

FOraſmuch as the ſaid imputed righteouſneſs is ſtyled ſo often in Scripture the righteouſneſs of God, which is of, by, from, or through the faith of Chriſt, I ſhall think it not amiſs thereupon to propoſe two or three Queſtions, and anſwer thereunto.

Q. *Doth a ſinner need ought more than the righteouſneſs it ſelf of Chriſt to make him righteous, or to juſtifie him in the ſight of God?*

Anſw. It is moſt apparently evident, that he doth, even from the ſaid iterated deſcription of

of a ſinners juſtification, it being ſtyled the righteouſneſs of God, which is by faith of Jeſus Chriſt. It is obſervable, that the Apoſtle doth not ſtyle it ſimply the righteouſneſs of God which is by Jeſus Chriſt, (although this is a truth worthy of all acceptation;) neither doth he always ſtyle it a righteouſneſs which is by faith ſimply: but he ſtyles it explicitly a righteouſneſs which is through the faith of Chriſt, *Phil.* 3. 9. and which is by faith of Jeſus Chriſt, *Rom.* 3. 22. I do the rather commend this to obſervation, becauſe it may ſerve to prevent an evaſion, or anſwer an objection, that ſome I well know are apt to make, ſaying, that where our imputed righteouſneſs is ſtyled a righteouſneſs which is of, by, or through faith; there the word (Faith) is to be taken relatively or objectively, *i.e.* not for the grace of Faith, but for the object of it; not for Faith it ſelf, but for Chriſt Jeſus the object of it. Now be it obſerved, that the Apoſtle adds to the word (Faith Chriſt) *Phil.* 3. 9. and (Jeſus Chriſt) *Rom.* 9. 22. the Apoſtle therein interpreting what he meant by Faith in thoſe other ſayings of his, where he ſtyles it a righteouſneſs which is of Faith, that is, that by faith he meant *Faith*, not *Chriſt* ſimply, or the object of Faith meerly, but faith in Chriſt. And to make the Apoſtle to have meant otherwiſe, is to make him to have ſpoken non-ſenſe in ſaying (a righteouſneſs which is by faith of Jeſus Chriſt;) as if he had or meant to ſay, a righteouſneſs which is through Chriſt of Chriſt, or which is of Jeſus Chriſt of Jeſus Chriſt; even as to make the like conſtruction of the word (Faith) for the object of Faith, in that ſaying *Rom.* 3. 25. *Through faith*

in his blood, is to make the Apoſtle nonſenſically to have ſaid, Through his blood in his blood. And yet this is (not without ſhame and ſadneſs of heart be it ſpoken) that work which ſome, to the reproach of Proteſtancy, and to the hardening of our common Adverſaries, do make of the Scriptures, as if by faith it ſelf, and the object of faith, one and the ſame thing were to be underſtood: or as if in that ſaying of S. *Peter* (*Acts* 3. 16. *His name through faith in his name hath made this man ſtrong*) the name or perſon of Chriſt, and faith in him, did mean the ſelf ſame thing, faith being not to be conſtrued as meaning the thing it ſelf (Faith) but onely the object thereof, Chriſts name or perſon.

The premiſſes conſidered, it undeniably appears, that faith in Jeſus Chriſt is as well neceſſary to juſtifie a ſinner in the ſight of God, as is the righteouſneſs it ſelf of Chriſt; even as faith in Chriſts name was as well neceſſary for the working of Miracles, as was his name or power it ſelf. And I deſire this the rather to be minded, becauſe it may ſerve to detect and rectifie the miſtake of Dr. *Grew*, who in his late Book ſtyled the Lord our righteouſneſs, (Sermons upon *Jer.* 23. 6.) ſays p. 200. even as others have ſaid before him, *viz. That a ſinner needs no more than Chriſts righteouſneſs to juſtifie him in the ſight of God.* I grant indeed, that in ſome ſenſe the ſaying is very true, foraſmuch as Chriſts righteouſneſs is *in ſuo genere*, *i.e.* in the ſphere or ſeries of a meritorious cauſe all-ſufficient to juſtifie a ſinner, even all and every ſinner in the ſight of God, and nothing more of that kind is needful for that purpoſe.

But

But foraſmuch as, 1. A ſaying, which is onely true reſpectively, or in a certain limited ſenſe, may be well ſaid (ſpeaking ſimply and abſolutely) to be falſe.

2. Foraſmuch as it is not fit and good for edification, but of native tendency to deception, to affirm that concerning a thing in ſimple and abſolute terms, and without due explication, which is onely verified in ſome one limited ſenſe or other, I cannot juſtifie the Doctors ſo ſaying.

3. Foraſmuch as it doth not appear, that the Doctor did onely intend the ſaid true meaning in that ſaying, but rather the contrary (it being his intent, as it is indeed of too many, to inſinuate, that no righteouſneſs of our own, but onely the righteouſneſs of Chriſt himſelf, is needful to juſtifie a ſinner in the ſight of God;) I am ſo far from juſtifying him, that I ſhall altogether leave him with the reſt of the Brethren in that ſaying to their own defence. For I can ſay no leſs, than that there are many things needful to juſtifie a ſinner in the ſight of God, and each of which do *ſuo modo*, after their own manner, or in their own proper place and kind, juſtifie him, ſomething *ex parte Dei*, ſomething *ex parte Chriſti*, ſomething *ex parte Evangelii*, ſomething *ex parte noſtri*; on Gods part, Chriſts part, the Goſpels part, our part; Gods mercy, Chriſts merit, the Goſpel Law, a Sinners faith: all which do in their kind or rank, and after a way peculiar to each, juſtifie a ſinner in the ſight of God. *Exempli gratiâ*: Gods mercy as the inward moving, Chriſts merit as the external impulſive cauſe, the Goſpel Law as the inſtrumental cauſe of conveyance, a ſinners

own faith in Christ as the condition thereof, I adde also, pardon it self, the imputed righteousnes I am now speaking of, is intrinsecally needful to the justification of a sinner before God, it being the form or thing it self, which doth constitute a sinners justification, or wherein it doth consist: and as the form of a thing is absolutely necessary to its being, and without which it is not (*forma dat esse*;) so is pardon of sin absolutely necessary: and as the other (Gods mercy, Christs merit, the Gospel Law, and a sinners faith) are extrinsecally, so this is intrinsecally necessary to justifie a sinner in the sight of God. Hereupon it abundantly appears, that it is a saying too too loose and extravagant to say, That a sinner needs no more than the righteousnes of Christ to justifie him in the sight of God.

CHAP.

CHAP. XIII.

Q. *In what ſenſe is the word (Faith) to be taken in thoſe Scriptures, wherein forgiveneſs of ſin is inſinuated to be the fruit or conſequent of Faith, and wherein it is ſtyled the righteouſneſs of God which is by Faith?* Anſw. *It is not taken ſtrictly, as excluding all other Evangelical graces in a Sinner, viz. Repentance and ſincere Reſolution for amendment of life; but in a large ſenſe as comprizing them, theſe being of the very eſſence of Faith, as juſtifying, or as taken (though not in a ſtrict Philoſophical, yet) in a Scriptural conſtruction or importance of the word.*

FOraſmuch as in that iterated ſaying of the Apoſtle, wherein he ſtyles a ſinners imputed righteouſneſs the righteouſneſs of God, which is by faith in Chriſt or through Chriſt, he doth unqueſtionably mean as he ſpake, by Faith meaning Faith, and by Chriſt Chriſt. I ſhall next propoſe the following Queſtion.

Q. *In what ſenſe is the grace of Faith to be taken in the ſaid ſayings, wherein a ſinners imputed righteouſneſs is inſinuated to be the iſſue, product, or conſequent of his believing in Chriſt? Whether is faith there to be taken in a ſtrict ſenſe, as excluding all*

all other Evangelical graces? (Exempli gratiâ: *Repentance for sin, an holy resolution to return to God in new obedience*——) *or else in a large sense, as including and comprehending them?*

Answ. It is most evident by the current of plain Scripture as plain can be, that a sinners imputed righteousness (the non-imputation or remission of sin) is promised unto, and doth depend upon, his repentance and amendment, as well as upon his faith or believing: and for that cause we cannot in reason, or agreeably in any wise to the Analogy of Faith, construe the grace of Faith in the said sayings, in a strict but in a large sense, and as it is not unusual in many Scriptures, *viz.* not as excluding, but as including, supposing or comprehending other Evangelical duties, vertues, or graces. (It hath been already said in chap. 5. that remission of sin is not styled a righteousness without works, because it is without the works of repentance and amendment.) It is matter of sadness, that a Minister of the Gospel should (by any Protestant Professor) be put to prove, that repentance and amendment is one part of the condition of his pardon, or discharge from the guilt of his sin. Let this his discharge be expressed by what Scriptural name soever, Redemption, Reconciliation, Justification, Non-condemnation——) as well as Faith in Christ strictly taken; and consequently that his pardon or discharge is by vertue of Gods gracious promise in Christ, the issue, fruit, or consequent of his repentance and amendment, and not of his faith alone, as strictly taken and exclusively to them, or in contradistinction from them. The Question in hand is, I confess, of ex-

exceeding great moment, and for that cauſe it would be very expedient to make anſwer thereunto more at large, were it not of very eaſie reſolution. But becauſe of the common prejudices, which too too many Brethren have conceived againſt it, ſome perhaps will deem, that much more than I have as yet ſaid, is very neceſſary to be ſpoken in the matter, and of which neceſſity if I ſhall be convinced, I may not improbably (God ſparing my Life, and continuing Health to me in my old age) endeavour a more copious Diſcourſe concerning that point. Mean while I will conclude this Chapter onely by aſſerting it as a moſt indubitable truth, *viz.* That in all ſuch ſayings as before cited faith is to be taken in ſuch a large ſenſe as in all thoſe Scriptures, wherein they are ſaid to be bleſſed who truſt in God, (a ſaying frequent with thoſe Sacred Writers *David* and *Solomon*;) by which truſt ſuch a truſt in God is meant, as doth imply other graces or duties conſequent thereunto, and virtually therein contained; even as the fruit is in the ſeed or root, faith being indeed a radical grace, or a principle of all religious actings. And in this large ſenſe it is taken in thoſe two Scriptures recorded in the Book of *Daniel*, where *Nebuchadnezzar* ſpeaking concerning the miraculous preſervation of the three Children ſays, *That God did deliver his Servants that truſted in him*, chap. 3. 28. and wherein *Darius* alſo ſpeaking of a like miraculous deliverance of the Prophet *Daniel*, ſays, *That no hurt was found upon him, becauſe he believed in his God*, chap. 6. 23. in both which places the Antecedent is put for the Conſequent, (a manner of ſpeaking uſual in Scripture, as alſo the Conſequent

quent oft times for the Antecedent, things of uſeful obſervation;) I mean the Antecedent in thoſe ſayings is uſed as implying what was Conſequent to their faith and truſt in God, and upon which their preſervations or deliverances did mainly and more immediately under God depend, *viz.* their renouncing of the Idol-worſhip ſet up by *Nebuchadnezzar*, and the not renouncing of the true God, no not for a day, which was commanded by *Darius*; for ſuch in effect I conceive to be the intent of *Darius* his command: and ſo would *Daniels* omitting to pray to God for the ſpace of the time interdicted have been interpreted, *viz.* a renouncing *pro tempore* the true and living God. As to the ſenſe wherein faith is to be taken in the ſaid Scriptures, or in any other wherein Juſtification, Remiſſion of ſin, Imputation of righteouſneſs, or Salvation, is attributed unto it as the fruit or conſequent thereof, there will be occaſion to ſpeak ſomewhat more of it in ſome other Chapter towards the later end of this Diſcourſe, whither I ſhall refer the Reader. See chap. 29. at large.

CHAP.

CHAP. XIV.

Another Scriptural Title given to the ſaid imputed righteouſneſs is in its being ſtyled, The righteouſneſs of the faith of *Abraham*, which he had being yet uncircumciſed, Rom. 4. 11. *the whole Verſe being opened more at large, and vindicated from mis-interpretation too commonly received. Caution given for a due underſtanding as well of the Authors full as true meaning, in his aſſerting Juſtification or Remiſſion of ſin (a righteouſneſs promiſed in the Law of Faith) to be it which S.* Paul *doth ſtyle the righteouſneſs of God, and which is by faith, the Author in that his aſſertion muſt not be underſtood as excluding, but as ſuppoſing and including that other branch or kind of righteouſneſs, which in the Goſpel or Law of Faith is commanded.*

I Shall inſtance onely in one other Scriptural Phraſe, whereby the ſaid imputed righteouſneſs is expreſſed, although in effect it be but the ſame which was ſpecified in chap. 11. See *Rom.* 4. 11. wherein it is ſtyled, *The righteouſneſs of the faith which* Abraham *had, yet being uncircumciſed.* (*And he received the ſign of Circumciſion,*

on, that is, the sign Circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith, which he had yet being uncircumcised, that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised, that righteousness might be imputed to them also. By the righteousness of *Abrahams* faith I do conceive there to be meant the reward of his faith, *viz.* justification or imputed righteousness, which as it was promised to him not through the Law, but through Faith, ver. 13. so it did accrue to him upon his actual obedientiall faith, even as it shall likewise accrue unto all other sinners (both Jews and Gentiles) upon such a faith as his was before Circumcision; for this righteousness, saith the Apostle, shall be imputed to every Child of *Abrahams* faith, though he be not circumcised, *i.e.* to every one who walks in the steps of that faith which *Abraham* had, being yet uncircumcised, ver. 12. Whether S. *Paul* doth there speak of Circumcision (received by *Abraham* primarily in its Institution, and secondarily in his Body) as mans seal is a question, but without all question he speaks of it as it was Gods seal, and God doth not seal, that any man believeth, he sealeth onely what himself saith, testifieth, or promiseth, *viz.* his own part of the Covenant, *viz.* that upon the performance of the righteousness (the righteousness of faith) therein commanded, sinners shall partake of the righteousness (the righteousness which is by, from, or through faith) therein promised. And it seems observable, that the Apostle there doth not say, that Circumcision received by *Abraham* was a seal of his faith, (as if God did thereby testifie that *Abraham* believed;) but of the righteousness of his faith, *i.e.* of the validity to righteousness

of

of that kind of Faith, or ſpecifical Faith, which he had being uncircumciſed. In this ſenſe the word (Faith) is taken in, 2 *Tim.* 1. 5. S. *Paul* there ſaying, That that faith which was firſt in *Timothies* Mother and Grandmother, was alſo in proceſs of time in *Timothy* himſelf: where he doth not mean the ſame perſonal individual faith which they had, (for *Accidentia non migrant à ſubjecto in ſubjectum*;) but a faith of the ſame ſort or ſpecies, that is, and as the Apoſtle doth there ſpecifie it by that differencing Character, a faith unfeigned. And in this ſenſe alſo muſt that expreſſion (the faith of *Abraham*, in ver. 16.) be underſtood, as alſo in ver. 24. where in the expreſſion (it ſhall be imputed) by the Relative (it) is not meant *Abrahams* perſonal individual faith, for this was imputed to *Abraham* in perſon, to him alone, and to no Child of his;) but to ſuch a kind of Faith as *Abrahams* was, *i. e.* to a working faith, albeit without ſuch works as were there intended, and related unto by the Apoſtle. Briefly then, S. *Paul* in ſaying, that Circumciſion was a ſeal of the righteouſneſs of the faith, which *Abraham* had yet being uncircumciſed, doth mean, that it was a ſeal of his righteouſneſs, pardon, or juſtification, upon condition of believing with ſuch a kind of faith as he did, or had while uncircumciſed, *i. e.* a faith without the deeds of the Law. It was a ſeal of the truth of this promiſe or covenant, and of Gods faithfulneſs in performing it. He that believeth like a Child of *Abraham*, *i. e.* that ſo believeth as to walk uprightly before God, although not circumciſed, ſhall be made righteous, pardoned, juſtified, or (to ſpeak in the very words of the Apoſtle in that

verſe)

verſe) ſhall have righteouſneſs imputed to him, even as it was to *Abraham*, even that righteouſneſs which God is ſaid (ver. 6.) to impute without works unto that man, whom *David* doth pronounce bleſſed.

I need not here move the queſtion, why the ſaid imputed righteouſneſs is ſtyled the righteouſneſs of the faith of *Abraham*: for the reaſons hereof are obvious; and if they were not ſo, yet may they be collected from what hath been at large anſwered to the queſtion indefinitely propoſed, chap. 11. why this imputed righteouſneſs is ſtyled the righteouſneſs which is of faith. Onely I deſire it may be obſerved, that the Apoſtle in ſtyling the ſaid imputed righteouſneſs the righteouſneſs of the faith which *Abraham* had yet being uncircumciſed, doth plainly interpret his own meaning, in his having ſtyled this righteouſneſs a righteouſneſs without works, *i.e.* without Circumciſion, or any ſuch legal works, without which he ſays in the cloſe of this ver. 11. that righteouſneſs ſhall alſo be imputed to all *Abrahams* Children, even as it was to *Abraham* their father.

Q. *Is not Chriſts righteouſneſs it ſelf meant in that expreſſion of the Apoſtle, wherein he aſſerts Circumciſion to have been the ſeal of the righteouſneſs of* Abrahams *faith, faith being there to be taken for the object of faith, which object is Chriſts righteouſneſs?*

Anſw. No. For, 1. I remember no place of Scripture, where Chriſts righteouſneſs is ſtyled the righteouſneſs of faith. Yea, I remember onely one place, *viz. Rom.* 5. 18. wherein by the word righteouſneſs is meant the righteouſneſs of Chriſt; and this onely according to our laſt

Eng-

English Translation of the Bible; for as the word is in the Original, not δικαιοσύνη, but δικαίωμα (it being rendred by divers Latine Translators not *justitia*, but *justificatio*;) so by the Genevah Translators it is rendred not by the righteousnes of one, but by the justifying of one; or as agreeably to the Original, δι' ἑνὸς δικαιώματος, it might be rendred, By one justifying, *i.e.* by one means, or meritorious cause of justifying, styled in the verse following ὑπακοὴ τοῦ ἑνὸς, the obedience of one, *i.e.* of one Jesus Christ, ver. 17.

2. Although the righteousnes of Christ being a thing revealed in Scripture is to be believed, and so may be called an object of faith (as whatsoever the Scriptures do reveal may be said to be an object of faith;) yet was it onely a partial object of *Abrahams* faith, the word of God being the full or complete object thereof: so that if we take faith here for the object of faith, we may as well, yea must (for ought I know) as necessarily take it for the whole object, or any other part of the object of *Abrahams* faith, as for this part of its object, the righteousnes of Christ.

3. To construe the word (Faith) in the said figurative sense for the object of Faith (Christs righteousnes) seems to be a sensless contradiction to the Apostle: for whereas the Apostle says plainly, that *Abraham received circumcision a seal of the righteousnes of faith, which he had being yet uncircumcised*; This construction makes him to have said, *Abraham* received circumcision a seal of the righteousnes of the righteousnes, which he had yet being uncircumcised.

Having hitherto ſpoken of that righteouſneſs, which is expreſſly ſaid in Scripture to be imputed to believing ſinners; I ſhall now proceed to enquire, whether any thing be expreſſly ſaid in Scripture to be imputed unto them for, or to righteouſneſs: and touching this inquiry, together with the reſolution of ſuch material queſtions as are incident thereunto, the reſidue of this part will be taken up.

Onely at the cloſe of this chapter, and indeed of all that I have to ſay at preſent concerning remiſſion of ſin as that righteouſneſs, which is ſaid in Scripture to be for Chriſts ſake imputed to believing ſinners, I ſhall think it neceſſary for the prevention of miſtake, and for the due underſtanding as well of my full as true meaning in the premiſſes, to requeſt the Reader to take notice, that whereas in certain of the foregoing Chapters I have ſpoken of a twofold branch of a ſinners Evangelical righteouſneſs, the one being *officium*, duty commanded; the other *beneficium*, mercy or benefit promiſed in the Goſpel or Law of Faith: And whereas having proved, that neither of theſe two parts or kinds of righteouſneſs are meant by that righteouſneſs, which S. *Paul* ſtyles his own, in oppoſition to that which he ſtyles the righteouſneſs of God, and which is of, from, by, or through faith; I have withall aſſerted, that juſtification or remiſſion of ſin (this being the righteouſneſs promiſed to ſinners conditionally upon their faith) is it, which S. *Paul* doth ſtyle the righteouſneſs of God, and which is by faith: whereas I ſay, this hath been aſſerted by me, I muſt not in that expreſs aſſertion be underſtood as excluding, but as ſuppoſing and including that other branch of righteouſneſs

ouſneſs which is commanded in the Goſpel. For as I am perſwaded, that by that righteouſneſs which S. *Paul* calls his own, which is of the Law, in oppoſition to that by him ſtyled the righteouſneſs which is of God by faith, he doth not onely mean the righteouſneſs which (when time was) was commanded in that Law, but alſo all thoſe Privileges, Prerogatives, Emoluments, or Advantages, which were therein promiſed to the Obſervers thereof; ſo I do readily acknowledge, that both that righteouſneſs which is promiſed, and that alſo which is commanded in the Goſpel or Law of Faith, are to be underſtood as comprized in that righteouſneſs which S. *Paul* ſtyles in thoſe various phraſes, The righteouſneſs of God, The righteouſneſs of Faith, The righteouſneſs of the faith which *Abraham* had being yet uncircumciſed, with the like expreſſions to this purpoſe. Yea, if any one that affirms, that the righteouſneſs commanded in the Law of Faith is the prime thing, or that which is moſt immediately to be underſtood by the ſaid expreſſions of the Apoſtle, I ſhall not gainſay; it being ſufficient for my purpoſe, that the righteouſneſs which is promiſed in the Law of Faith (*viz.* Juſtification or Remiſſion of ſin) be acknowledged to be one part of that righteouſneſs, which S. *Paul* ſtyles the righteouſneſs of God which is by faith, and included therefore in the ſaid expreſſions of the Apoſtle, where he ſpeaks of this righteouſneſs in oppoſition to that righteouſneſs which he calls his own, which is of the Law. And I ſhall think it here not amiſs, to commend to obſervation the difference betwixt the ſaid two parts or kinds of righteouſneſs, the one commanded, the other

for Chriſts ſake promiſed in the Goſpel or Law of Faith; how that they differ as the way to an end, and the end it ſelf of that way; righteouſneſs promiſed in the Goſpel being the end, or ſcope, the reward, the βραβεῖον, or prize to be attained (ſo the Apoſtle ſtyles it, *Phil.* 3. 14.) and righteouſneſs therein commanded as the condition, being the means of attaining it, as is the Apoſtles expreſſion, ſaying ver. 11. *If by any means I may attain* —— Both theſe (the Means and the End) ſeem evidently to be comprized in that expreſſion of the Apoſtle, *Rom.* 9. 30. where ſpeaking concerning the believing Gentiles he ſays, that they attained to righteouſneſs, even the righteouſneſs which is of Faith, *i. e.* they did take the right way, and they obtained thereby their deſired end, *viz.* they followed the way of righteouſneſs preſcribed in the Goſpel (the way of Faith without the works of the Law) and in the purſuit of that way they did attain to, or obtain, the righteouſneſs therein promiſed: whereas the Jews by miſſing or avoiding the way, and taking another courſe, attained not the end, as is ſaid in the following verſes.

And as I have in the foregoing Chapters ſhewed ſeveral reaſons, why the ſaid righteouſneſs promiſed in the Goſpel (Juſtification or Remiſſion of ſin) is ſtyled the righteouſneſs of God, and which is by or through Faith; ſo it were eaſie to ſuggeſt ſeveral conſiderable reaſons, why that other branch of Evangelical righteouſneſs (commanded in the Goſpel, and in the ſaid expreſſions comprized) may very fitly be ſtyled the righteouſneſs of God, the righteouſneſs of Faith, or which is by Faith. But it being not ſo pertinent to my purpoſe in hand,

to

to insist upon those reasons, I will therefore forbear here to specifie or suggest them; and the rather because I think it sufficient to have proved, that whether by the said expressions of the Apostle (The righteousness of God, The righteousness of Faith, The righteousness which is by or from Faith ——) we do understand precisely the righteousness in the Law of Faith promised, or the righteousness therein commanded, or both the one and the other to be therein comprized (neither of them according to my perswasion being to be excluded) I have manifested, and I hope it is apparently manifest, that by that righteousness wherein S. *Paul* desired to be found (by him styled the righteousness which is of God by Faith, in opposition to that which he styles his own, which is of the Law) is not meant the personal righteousness of Christ, or the imputation thereof, in opposition to our Evangelical righteousness, whether that righteousness of duty which is commanded, or that righteousness of reward and benefit, which is promised in the Law of Faith; it having been a mistake too too common, and for the commonness of it the more to be privately lamented and openly opposed, in such sort to interpret that so much vexed Scripture. And therefore let that Note in the Assemblies (so called) Annotations upon the said Scripture, *Phil.*3.9. be no otherwise noted, than as a mistake to be avoided: where by our being found not in our own righteousness, but in that which is through the faith of Christ, the Annotator would have us to understand our being clothed with the righteousness of Christ imputed to us. As for that Metaphorical expression of the said Annotator (our

being clothed with the righteousneſs of Chriſt) I have at large declared my thoughts in Chap. 30. of the former part of this Diſcourſe, by way of anſwer to the Queſtion, *Whether Believers may be truly or fitly ſaid to be clothed with the righteouſneſs of Chriſt?* wherein hath been manifeſted the unfitneſs of that unſcriptural and unedifying phraſe, it being a phraſe as purely of humane invention, ſo alſo taken up or occaſioned by the mis-underſtanding of the true ſenſe of that other unſcriptural phraſe, wherein Chriſts righteouſneſs hath been ordinarily ſaid to be imputed to us, and the aſſerting of a ſenſe of that ſaying contrary to the Scriptures; it having been alſo the manner of ſome popular Preachers to direct and exhort their Hearers to live out of themſelves, *i.e.* out of their own perſonal graces, and gracious diſpoſitions, upon a naked Chriſt, or the naked righteouſneſs of Chriſt (imputed to them) for righteouſneſs and ſalvation. This is that new mode of language of later times I have obſerved from the Mouths and Pens of ſome Preachers, particularly from Mr. *Edward Pearſe*, in his late printed book, ſtyled *The Great Concernment*, and ſaid to be the laſt Sermons that he preached before his death: becauſe he hath miſerably abuſed and mis-interpreted every Text of the Sacred Scriptures alledged by him for his ſaid purpoſe, I will therefore relate his words, and make a ſhort reply thereunto.

This living out of our own graces, ſays he, *upon Chriſts naked (imputed) righteouſneſs, is that which is called the readineſs of the Lambs wife*, Rev. 19. 7, 8. *and by the righteouſneſs of the Saints is there meant the righteouſneſs of Chriſt imputed to us* ——

And

And he says also, *That this is that robe mentioned* Luke 15.22. *and that this imputed righteousness of Christ is meant in* Phil.3.8,9. *and also in* Isa.61.10.

In all the said Scriptures he hath erred exceedingly from the true sense and meaning of them, having expressly uttered the dreams and imaginations of his own brain and fancy. One of the said Scriptures I have already copiously vindicated in this second part of my Discourse, having therein manifested, that by the Righteousness, wherein St. *Paul* desired to be found (in opposition to that styled *his own*, which is of the Law) is not meant Christs personal Righteousness, and much less Christs Righteousness as imputed to us; but that Righteousness, which is commanded and is promised to Sinners in the Gospel. As for those two Scriptures (*Isa.*61.10. and *Lev.*19.7,8.) I have vindicated them from the same misconstruction made of them by others in the thirtieth Chapter of the first part of this Discourse. And as for that other Scripture (*Luke* 15.22.) my Reply to this Author is, That he had no more reason, colour, or shadow of reason to say, that Christs Righteousness imputed is the thing meant by the Robe there mentioned, than by the Ring, and Shoes, and fatted Calf, which together with the Robe were alike ordered by that glad Father for the welcoming home of his lost Son.

CHAP. XV.

Q. *Is there any thing expreſly ſaid in Scripture to be imputed to us for righteouſnes?* Anſw. *Yes*, viz. *Faith, it being thus recorded in the Old Teſtament*, Gen. 15. 6. *and the record thereof produced in the New Teſtament once by S.* James, *chap.* 2. 23. *and twice by S.* Paul, Gal. 3. 6. *and* Rom. 4. 3. *in which chapter he doth aſſert little leſs than ten times over, that* Abrahams *faith was imputed to him, and that the like or ſame ſpecifical faith ſhall be imputed to us for righteouſneſs*, ver. 3, 5, 9, 20, 22, 23, 24.

Q. *IS there any thing expreſly ſaid in Scripture to be imputed to believing ſinners for righteouſneſs?*

Anſw. Yes: their faith is ſaid both in the Scriptures of the Old and of the New Teſtament to be ſo imputed. For thus it is reported concerning *Abrahams* faith, *Gen.* 15. 6. *And he believed in the Lord, and he counted it unto him for righteouſneſs.* This ſaying is once quoted by Saint *James*, chap. 2. 23. and once by Saint *Paul* in his Epiſtle to the *Galatians*, chap. 3. 6. *Even as Abraham believed God, and it was accounted* (or imputed) *to him for righteouſneſs.* And more than once

once by the same Apostle the same is asserted, chap. 4.3, & 5, 9, 10,22,23. in which verses *Abrahams* faith is five times over asserted to have been imputed to him for righteousness. And lest it might be thought to have been the peculiar privilege of *Abrahams* personal faith, to have been accounted to him for righteousness; for as the Jews said to our Saviour, *Art thou greater than our father Abraham?* so possibly may it be objected by a Christian, specially of the weaker sort, Is my faith as strong as was *Abrahams*, or comparable in degree to his? The Apostle therefore doth not content himself to have said, ver.11,12. *And he received the sign of Circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith, which he had yet being uncircumcised; that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised, that righteousness might be imputed to them also: And the father of Circumcision to them, who are not of the Circumcision onely, but also walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham, which he had being yet uncircumcised:* but he doth also plainly and explicitly again assert the same imputation touching the faith of every one to the worlds end, that shall be a true Believer, saying ver. 23, 24. *Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him, but for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him, who raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead.*

'Tis true indeed, that circumcision spoken of ver. 11. did seal the righteousness of *Abrahams* personal faith, faith subjectively and individually taken, yet not as his faith, *i. e.* not simply, and precisely as his (for if so, it would seal righteousness, blessedness, justification, or remission of sin to none else;) but *exemplariter*, for examples

amples ſake, as his faith without circumciſion, and the deeds of the law was to be a pattern of the way of juſtifying ſinners (both Jews and Gentiles) under the Goſpel, *Abraham* being the Father, *i. e.* the exemplar of the Goſpel-way of juſtifying ſinners (for ſo father is taken ver. 12.) that ſo, as the Apoſtle expreſſes it, *Gal.* 3. 14. *The bleſſing of Abraham might come upon the Gentiles through Jeſus Chriſt.* Briefly, it did not ſeal the ſaid righteouſneſs to his faith as his individually, but as it was ſuch a faith, as the promiſe, which was ſealed was made unto, *i. e.* a true, lively, operative, and working faith. Although circumciſion did ſeal his juſtification, he having that ſort of faith, which the general promiſe was made unto; yet it did not ſeal his juſtification primarily, but conſequentially, *i. e.* by ſealing the general promiſe. It ſealed the righteouſneſs of his faith as he was the deſigned Father, or pattern (for in this ſenſe the word Father is taken, ver. 12.) as his faith was to be a pattern to believing ſinners, reſpectively both to the nature, as alſo to the privilege of his juſtification, or righteouſneſs conſequent thereunto; which righteouſneſs, juſtification, or remiſſion of ſin, even as *Abraham* is called the Father of the Faithful, ſo is it ſtyled their Fathers bleſſing, common now to believing Jews and Gentiles.

The premiſſes conſidered, let it be obſerved, how much a late learned Author was out of the way of truth in ſaying, *That the ſound of the imputation of Chriſts righteouſneſs to believers is as loud in the Scriptures, as was that of the trumpet upon Mount Sinai, it being ſounded forth almoſt ten times in that foreſited Chapter, Rom.* 4. Whereas in truth,

truth, it is the imputation of Faith, for righteouſneſs that is there ſpoken of; but of the imputation of Chriſts righteouſneſs there is not the leaſt whiſper in all that Chapter.

CHAP. XVI.

Q. *What is meant by faith in thoſe Scriptures both of the Old and New Teſtament, wherein it is ſaid to be imputed to Believers for righteouſneſs? Is it to be taken properly for faith it ſelf, or figuratively,* i. e. *objectively, for Chriſts righteouſneſs the object of faith?* Anſw. *Properly for the thing faith, or faith it ſelf, the truth of which anſwer is proved by many reaſons, and cleared from certain objections, with the ſuffrage of the very learned and moſt induſtrious* Mr R. Baxter, *and reflection upon a paſſage of* Dr Grew *in his Sermons upon* Jer. 23. 6.

Q. WHat is meant by faith in the ſaid iterated ſaying of the Apoſtle [Faith is, was, and ſhall be imputed to Believers for righteouſneſs?]

Anſw. It is famouſly known, that there are ſome learned Authors, and of thoſe no ſmall ſum, who would have us to believe, that by faith

faith [ſo expreſly and frequently there ſaid to be imputed] is not meant faith, *i. e.* the grace of faith, or any act thereof, but the obedience, ſatisfaction, or righteouſneſs of Chriſt believed on, or apprehended by faith. And becauſe it is a thing, that having diſcovered it ſelf to the world, cannot be hid, it muſt be therefore acknowledged, that this conſtruction is formed into an Article of the faith of two Aſſemblies in time of the long Parliament and reign of the late Protector (ſo called) the one ſitting at *Weſtminſter*, the other at the *Savoy*, that conſiſting for the greateſt part of Presbyteriall, and theſe altogether (for ought I ever heard) of Divines ſtyled Congregational and Independent, who however differing each from other in other things, did too too unhappily accord in the miſconſtruction of the word [Faith] in the ſaid celebrated ſaying of the Apoſtle, which they would have to be taken not properly and formally for faith it ſelf, but figuratively, or objectively for the righteouſneſs of Chriſt believed, or reſted upon, which appears not onely by the Printed Confeſſions of their faith, but alſo by that Catechiſm ſtyled The Larger Catechiſm agreed upon by the Aſſembly of Divines at *Weſtminſter*. But bleſſed be God, that this is none of the Articles of the Church of *England*, to which ſubſcription is required; and therefore as for thoſe confeſſions, how good and wholſom in other things they may be, as I am not required, ſo neither am I able to aſſent to them in this matter, although owned by them as an Article of their private faith, yet was not in their power, nor in the power of any man, or Aſſemblies of men to make it any Article of the Common

faith

faith of Chriſtians; Faith therefore in that known, and common ſaying of the Apoſtle (faith is imputed to believers for righteouſneſs) is to be taken properly and formally for faith it ſelf, or believing, not figuratively or objectively, *i. e.* for the object of faith, the righteouſneſs of Chriſt believed on, even in the like propriety of conſtruction, as indeed it is to be taken in any other Scriptures, wherein any privilege whether pertaining to this life or the life to come is (under Chriſt) attributed to faith, as in that wherein our Saviour ſays to the diſeaſed woman, *Mat.* 9. 22. *Thy faith hath made thee whole* (it being in very deed faith in his name, that did it even no leſs, when it was done by Chriſt in perſon, than when a like miracle was done by him through the Miniſtery of St. *Peter Acts* 3.16.) and in thoſe Scriptures wherein we are ſaid to be ſaved through faith, juſtified by faith, and the like. I do the rather inſtance in the phraſe of our being juſtified by faith (an expreſſion frequent with our Apoſtle) becauſe theſe his phraſes [*Faith is imputed to us for righteouſneſs, and we are juſtified by, through, or from faith*] are perfectly equipollent, ſo that look in what conſtruction the word [Faith] is taken in the one, it is to be taken in the other, and in very deed it is in all the ſaid phraſes to be taken properly, it being the ſcope of the Apoſtle by that word to give us to underſtand, that faith it ſelf (the grace of faith) hath a certain intereſt, place, or office, in the juſtification of a ſinner; and under what notion, and upon what account it doth operate, or prove effectual to that end, will be declared in anſwer to certain Queſtions in the ſequel of this Diſcourſe, which in that behalf will

will be propoſed. I will only ſay here, that it was the ſcope of the Apoſtle in all the ſaid phraſes to intimate the neceſſity and the effectualneſs of faith as a means (of one kind, or other) to the righteouſneſs, or juſtification of a ſinner.

Obj. *Is not Chriſts righteouſneſs the meritorious cauſe of a Believers righteouſneſs?*

Anſw. Yes: For he was made our ſubſtitute ſo far forth as to be made ſin for us, or to bear the puniſhment of our ſins, whereby to purchaſe righteouſneſs for us, or that we might be made righteous; but it will not follow from thence, that his righteouſneſs it ſelf is imputed to us for righteouſneſs.

Obj. *Hath not faith an object, and is not Chriſts righteouſneſs the object of that faith, which is imputed to us for our juſtification?*

Anſw. 1. In the way of conceſſion, I grant, 1. That as every act doth imply one object, or another, about which it is converſant; ſo doth faith: and as a man cannot be ſaid to ſee, except he ſee ſomething; ſo not to believe, except he believe ſomething: and it is altogether a thing unreaſonable to conceive, that thoſe, who do affirm, that faith properly taken doth juſtifie us, or is imputed to us for righteouſneſs, do thereby mean faith as divided, or ſevered from its object.

2. I grant, that the righteouſneſs of Chriſt is a main thing to be believed, as well as other things revealed in the Scriptures, and that it is of far greater concernment to believe it, than many other things therein written and made known unto us.

2. Nevertheleſs in the way of oppoſition I anſwer, 1. The righteouſneſs of Chriſt is but a par-

partial, not the adequate, or ultimate object of that faith, which was imputed to *Abraham*, and which shall be imputed to us for righteousness; for it is said of *Abraham*, that he believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness, *Rom.* 4. 3. so that God, or the promise of God was the object of that his faith; and that faith, which the Apostle says shall be imputed to us, is said to have for its object Him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead, *i. e.* God the Father, *Eph.* 1. 17, 20.

2. We may believe the righteousness of Christ, even as well as other Articles of the Christian faith, and yet not be thereby justified, or have that faith imputed to us for righteousness.

3. For which reason possibly it comes to pass, that (as some have observed) whereas the object of faith as saving is expressed with great variety of phrase in Scripture, there is not to be found in all that variety any express mention of the righteousness of Christ, *e. g.* Sometimes Christs person is made the object of this faith, *John* 3. 16. *So God loved the world, that he gave ——— that whosoever believeth in him* ——— Sometime Christ in his word, or doctrine, *John* 5. 46. *Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me.* Sometimes Christ in the relation of his person; sometimes as he stands related to God as his only begotten Son, *John* 20. 31. *These things are written that ye might believe, that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God, and that* ——— Sometimes as he stands related to those ancient promises of God, recorded in the Old Testament, concerning the Messias as the off-spring of the Jewish nation, *John* 8. 24. *Except ye believe, that I am he, ye shall die in your sins.* Sometimes the raising of Christ from

from the dead is made the object of this faith, *Rom.* 10. 9. *If thou ſhalt confeſs with thy mouth the Lord Jeſus, and ſhalt believe in thy heart, that God raiſed him up from the dead, thou ſhalt be ſaved.* Sometimes God himſelf is ſolely ſpecified as the object of this faith, *Rom.* 4. 3. *Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for righteouſneſs.* Sometimes God through Chriſt, 1 *Pet.* 1. 21. *Who by him do do believe in God, who raiſed him up from the dead, and gave him glory, that our faith and hope might be in God.* Sometimes the record or teſtimony of God concerning his Son is made the object of this faith, 1 *John* 5. 10. Sometimes no object at all of this faith is expreſly mentioned, where yet the Goſpel is to be underſtood as the object thereof, *Mark* 16. 16. with ver. 15. *He that believeth*, i. e. that Goſpel, which the Apoſtles had in commiſſion to preach to every creature, ver. 15. *ſhall be ſaved* —— The premiſſes conſidered, it may ſeem ſtrange, why thoſe, who do aſſert, that by faith is meant Chriſts righteouſneſs (an object thereof as juſtifying never expreſly mentioned in Scripture) ſhould not as well, or rather aſſert, that by it is meant God, or Chriſt, or ſome object of faith in expreſs terms ſpecified in Scripture.

4. Although the righteouſneſs of Chriſt be one part of the object of faith, nevertheleſs it will not follow, that in the ſaid aſſertion of the Apoſtle (faith is imputed to believers, and was imputed to *Abraham* for righteouſneſs) the word faith is to be taken not formally for faith it ſelf, but objectively for the righteouſneſs of Chriſt, no more than it will from thence follow, that it is to be taken for God himſelf, or Chriſt in perſon the objects thereof. But that by faith is

meant

meant faith it ſelf (the grace of faith) ſeems manifeſt by the conſideration of theſe two things, *viz.* by the ſcope of the Apoſtle in that chapter, as alſo by the deſcription of *Abrahams* faith, which was imputed to him, and of that faith which the Apoſtle ſays ſhall be imputed to others for righteouſneſs.

1. The thing, which was imputed to *Abraham* for righteouſneſs, is ſaid by the Apoſtle to be that, which *Abraham* had being yet uncircumciſed. Now that, which the Apoſtle ſaid, that *Abraham* had being yet uncircumciſed, is not the righteouſneſs of Chriſt, but faith; for which ſee *Rom.* 4. 11. *And he received the ſign of circumciſion a ſeal of the righteouſneſs of the Faith, which he had being yet uncircumciſed.*

Obj. The antecedent to that relative, is not the word faith, but righteouſneſs, and ſo the meaning is, which righteouſneſs *i. e.* of Chriſt *Abraham* had being yet uncircumciſed?

Anſw. In the way of conceſſion; foraſmuch as the words [δικαιοσύνη and πίστις] are both of them of the feminine gender, I grant that the pronoun relative [ἥν,] which may in true conſtruction of Grammar indifferently refer either to the word Righteouſneſs, or to the word Faith as its antecedent.

2, In way of exception, 1. Although in Grammatical conſtruction it may poſſibly refer to either of them, nevertheleſs it doth truly refer to the word faith, as appears by the Apoſtles interpretation, or conſtruction thereof in the verſe immediately following, where ſpeaking of the believing Gentiles, he deſcribes them to be ſuch, as do walk in the ſteps of that Faith of our Father *Abraham*, which he had being yet uncir-

cumciſed. So that if we will believe the Apoſtle, the Relative which in verſe 11. doth not refer to the word righteouſneſs (as if he had meant, which righteouſneſs *Abraham* had being yet uncircumciſed) but to the word faith: Hence it follows unavoidably, That if the thing ſaid to be imputed to *Abraham* for righteouſneſs be that, which he is ſaid to have had being yet uncircumciſed, *i. e.* faith, hence I ſay it follows neceſſarily, that the thing imputed to *Abraham* for righteouſneſs was his faith, and not the righteouſneſs of Chriſt.

2 I anſwer *Ex abundanti*, By the righteouſneſs of faith in *Rom.* 4. 11. is not meant the righteouſneſs of Chriſt, but that righteouſneſs which is the fruit of faith, or doth accrue to ſinners by faith in Chriſt, as hath at large been manifeſted in the 14*th* Chapter of this Diſcourſe.

2. That faith, which was imputed to *Abraham* for righteouſneſs, is that, by which he believed in God, who quickneth the dead, and verſe 17. But Chriſts righteouſneſs cannot in any tolerable conſtruction be called that faith, by which *Abraham* believed in God, who quickneth the dead, and calleth the things that are not as though they were.

3. It is ſaid to be that faith, wherein *Abraham* was not weak, verſe 19. But the righteouſneſs of Chriſt cannot in reaſon be conceived to be that, wherein *Abraham* was not weak.

4. It is oppoſed unto doubting of the promiſe of God through unbelief, verſe 20. to which doubting the righteouſneſs of Chriſt carries no oppoſition, it being a thing predicamentally differing, or of a different kind from it.

It

It was that faith, by which he was fully assured, that he, which had promised, was able to perform. Thus it is described verse 21. and the imputation thereof so described, is affirmed verse 22. But no such thing can be affirmed concerning the righteousness of Christ, *viz.* That by it *Abraham* was assured, that he, who had promised, was able to perform it.

2. Consider what the Apostle says concerning that faith of other believers, which, as he asserts, shall be imputed to them for righteousness, *e.g.* 1. He says verse 5. *That to him, that worketh not, but believeth on him, who justifieth the ungodly, His faith is imputed to him for righteousness.* Hence it is evident, that that faith (whatsoever we understand by it) which is imputed to a believer for righteousness, is somewhat, that may be truly and properly called His, before such imputation of it be made unto him. Now it cannot be said of the righteousness of Christ, that that is any mans (even our adversaries in this controversie being judges) before the imputation of it be made unto him; but faith properly taken is the believers (at least in order of nature) before it be imputed.

2. That, which shall be imputed to others for righteousness, is said to be our believing on him, *that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead.* ver. 24. But the righteousness of Christ is not our believing on him, *who raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead.* Therefore it cannot be the Apostles meaning, that Christs righteousness is the very thing, which is there said to be imputed to us for righteousness.

Lastly, That the word faith here is to be taken properly for faith, and not figuratively for

Christs righteousnes is sufficiently apparent by the drift of the Apostle in his whole discourse concerning justification, which evidently was to direct unto and assert the true way of being justified, in opposition to that wrong way (through works and legal performances and not by faith, *Rom.* 9. 32.) which was embraced by many in those false times, according to the doctrine of their false Teachers. We may well suppose the Question to be the same with that of the Jaylors. What shall I do to be saved, or justified? Must we be circumcised and keep the law of *Moses* of necessity to justification, and salvation, or is it enough for that end to believe in Christ without such works? Thus is the Question stated *Acts* 15, beginning. This Question the Apostle determines in this Chapter, as in the Chapter foregoing, affirming constantly, That that which God now requires at our hands in order to our justification, or salvation, is not legal performances, works of the Judaical law, but faith in Christ. As for the righteousnes of Christ, this is not the thing required at our hands (as Dr *Owen* says) for our justification; this is it, which God required of Christ, and Christ did perform to the uttermost of what was required, and this righteousnes of Christ so required, and performed, the Apostle in his discourse concerning justification always supposeth, and sometimes intimateth in such places where he mentions the blood of Christ, *Rom.* 3. 25. and justification by his blood. Chap. 5. 9. and his being delivered for our offences, Chap. 4. 25. But the thing required of us, is our faith in Christ himself, or in God through Christ, as the Apostle most agreably to the occasion and

drift

drift of his diſcourſe doth determine. And verily for the Apoſtle to have certified them, that the righteouſneſs of Chriſt ſhould be imputed to them for righteouſneſs, or barely to have informed them, what Chriſt hath done for the procuring of righteouſneſs for them, had been, if not quite beſide, yet marvellouſly ſhort of the thing deſigned by him, which was plainly and directly this, *viz.* to make known unto them what was required of them, or to be performed by themſelves (through Gods grace aſſiſting and enabling them) for their being juſtified, or made righteous by Chriſt, which he affirms to be by their faith, or believing without the ſaid works of the Law. And thence it is, that ſpeaking concerning juſtification, redemption, and ſalvation by Chriſt, he doth ſo expreſly and frequently mention faith as the duty, or means required by God of us, or on our parts for the enjoyment thereof, *Rom.* 3. 25. and 5. 1, 2. *Eph.* 2. 8.

If any one ſhall deſire to hear, what more can be ſaid in this point, I ſhall refer him to what he may read, as in other Authors, ſo eſpecially in Mr *Baxters* late great Volume, ſtyled his *Cath. Theology*, Par. 3. p. 252, wherein he hath purpoſely and to very good purpoſe anſwered this Queſtion, Whether faith it ſelf be imputed to us for righteouſneſs? I will only tranſcribe the following words of his, and leave them to the Readers impartial conſideration.

If good men, and wiſe men (ſays he, p. 253, 254) *and men, that cry down the Papiſts and others for adding to Gods word, and corrupting it and calling it a noſe of wax, and introducing new Articles of faith, will yet own ſuch expoſitions as theſe* (they ſaying, *that by*

faith is not meant faith at all, but Christs righteousness in all those Scriptures, where faith is said to be imputed to believers for righteousness, Rom. 4. 3, 4, 10, 11, 13, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24) *and accuse those, that own them not, they are as great instances as most I remember, except the defenders of Transubstantion, how far education, or custome, or humane dependance, or faction, or partiality, and prejudice may blind the reason of professed Christians, and godly men. And that man, that dare lay his comforts and hopes of justification, and life upon such expositions of Gods word, should be modest in crying down the false hopes of others, and reproving them that build upon the sand.*

Quest. Are there any such as Mr *Baxter* here speaks of, who do lay their comfort and hopes of justification and life upon the righteousness of Christ alone, and not at all upon faith, or ought else in man, or done by man?

Answ. This is (for ought I know) ordinary with those, who deny faith properly taken to be imputed for righteousness, among whom I shall instance in Dr *Grew* for one of the said daring Adventurers, as doth evidently appear by many passages in his late Printed Sermons on *Jer.* 23. 6. Some whereof I shall recite, as followeth.

Holiness and holy duties (says he, p. 86.) *in the point of justification are but as Cyphers, here we must deny our best as well as our worst. Our eyes fixed on Christs righteousness made ours* (he means by imputation of the thing it self) *settles us on a firmer rock, than mount* Sion, *but fixed on our selves and our own righteousness within doors, as in a leaking vessel——— and therefore* (says he, p. 88.) *count all your own righteousness* (he means, *all our holiness and holy duties*) *loss and dung. And* p. 90. (says he) *many would be in commission with Christs righteousness* (he means, *Christs*

Christs righteousnes imputed in his own anti-gospel sense) and Gods free grace for their peace and comfort, but this is to have one foot on the firm ground, and another in a boat; but here is no standing. And p. 72. he makes a sinners being made righteous with the righteousnes of Christ imputed to him to be *Articulus stantis, & cadentis ecclesia*, for which he quotes the authority of *Luther*, mentioning the same also (if I do not misremember) in the Epistle prefixed to his book. And he doth so enhance the comfort of Christs righteousnes in his own heterodox sense imputed, as to say (p. 204.) *That upon account thereof the obedience of one Believer is more acceptable with God, than the obedience of all mankind in the first covenant.* And in p. 120. he makes as if nothing will quiet our consciences, but the imputation of Christs righteousnes in his sense as aforesaid.

Mr *Baxter* needs not to go far in seeking to find those bold Adventurers, who dare lay their comforts and hopes of justification and life upon such misexpolitions of Gods word as aforesaid, for here is one who dare (as it seems) do it with open face, and with superlative confidence.

CHAP. XVII.

Q. *Whence comes it to paſs, that ſo many very learned and moſt pious men have ſo much and miſerably miſtaken the true meaning of the word* [*Faith*] *in its being ſaid to be imputed to Believers for righteouſneſs, they interpreting by faith not to be meant faith, but the righteouſneſs of Chriſt?* Anſw. *Four things are aſſigned as the cauſes of it, wherein much is ſpoken for the removing of them out of the way of truth, whereby they may no longer obſtruct the free current thereof.*

Q. *WHence comes it to paſs, that ſo many godly and learned men have ſo miſtaken the true meaning of the word Faith in its being ſaid to be imputed to us for righteouſneſs?*

A. Not to mention the common infirmities of our degenerate nature (though regenerate) nor the hand of Satan our common Enemy, who is ſtill ſowing tares among the good ſeed in Gods field, I humbly conceive, that ſuch things as theſe may be main cauſes or occaſions thereof.

1. As the miſexpoſition of one Scripture doth oft times occaſion the miſconſtruction of another: ſo I do humbly conceive, that their miſexpoſition of all ſuch Scriptures, wherein we

are

are ſaid to be juſtified by faith, hath occaſioned their miſinterpretation of that word in other Scriptures, wherein faith is ſaid to be imputed to us for righteouſneſs: for theſe two things are apparent.

1. To be juſtified by faith, and to have faith imputed to us for righteouſneſs are phraſes ſynonymous, ſignifying the ſelf ſame thing as hath been already ſaid, and as is proveable from *Gal.* 3. 6. compared with ver. 8. where having ſaid ver. 6. That *Abraham* believed God and it was accounted to him for righteouſneſs, he interprets the ſaying to be all one, as Gods juſtifying *Abraham* by faith, ver. 8. And the Scriptures foreſeeing, *i. e. God foreſeeing, as the Scripture teſtifies, that he would juſtifie the Heathen through faith preached before the Goſpel unto* Abraham, *ſaying, In thee ſhall all nations (believing Gentiles as well as Jews) be bleſſed.*

2. Conſequently hereupon it ſufficiently appears by thoſe Synonymous expreſſions, that the word faith is to be taken in the ſame ſenſe in both the ſaid phraſes. And indeed, would the adverſe party grant, that it is faith it ſelf properly taken by which we are juſtified, they would not ſtick to yield, that our faith it ſelf is the thing, which is imputed to us for righteouſneſs. But foraſmuch as they do profeſſedly maintain, that in the former ſayings (we are juſtified by faith, and ſaved through faith and the like) the word faith is to be taken relatively, or objectively (not for faith it ſelf, but for Chriſts righteouſneſs the object of faith;) they have thereupon obliged themſelves to make the like miſconſtruction of the word in all thoſe many Scriptures, wherein faith is ſaid to be imputed

ted to us for righteousneſs. But it is commonly objected, that the habit or act of faith is sometimes taken for the object of faith.

Answ. 1. Though that be supposed, or granted, yet it will not follow from thence, that it is so to be taken in those Scriptures, wherein we are said to be justified by faith.

2. As in some Scriptures we are said to be justified simply by faith, so in other Scriptures, where that saying is interpreted, *We are said to be justified by faith in Christ* (Gal. 2. 16. *knowing, that a man is not justified by the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ.*) Whence observe, that the grace or act of faith are both of them there expressly mentioned. Now when the act and object are named together, and the act expressed and specified by an object suitable to it, and somewhat moreover immediately ascribed to this act, in this case to make a meer cypher of the act, and to ascribe the thing solely to the object, or as the onely thing to be understood by the act, is altogether against reason and without parallel in the Scripture.

I shall onely commend here these two things to observation, *viz.*

1. That the Scriptures speaking concerning a sinners justification, do sometimes express onely the grace of faith, ascribing it thereunto, as in *Rom.* 5. 11, *Being justified by faith.*——Sometimes they do express onely the object, so *Gal.* 3. 16. *That the blessing of* Abraham, *i. e. justification, might come upon the Gentiles through Jesus Christ.* Sometimes there is made express mention both of the grace, or act of faith, as also of its object. So in the Scripture occasionally forecited, *Gal* 2. 16, *Know-*

16. *Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ.*

2. From the said Scriptures compared together, I shall commend it to observation as a very safe rule, and very necessary for the deciding and preventing of needless contests, *viz.* That where the act of justifying faith is onely mentioned, there the object thereof is not to be excluded, but implyed. And on the other side, where the object of that faith is onely expressed, there faith it self is not to be excluded, but understood. And where both are expressly mentioned, we are there to preserve distinct notions of them, neither construing the object of faith for faith it self, nor faith it self simply, or precisely for its object. This rule well observed, is, I humbly conceive, a special means for the due interpretation of many Scriptures, which treat of the matters I am now speaking of, and for the ending of needless controversies.

3. Another thing which I conceive to be a cause of these misinterpretations of the word faith, is (as I am perswaded) a certain jealousy of derogating from Christ, and arrogating to our selves; which jealousy being causeless is of a most mischievous nature, and hath done much hurt in the Churches of Christ, as we have sadly experienced in those called *Antinomians*, who have entertained many false doctrines, because of that ῥῆμα, or λόγ (as are the words of Scripture in like cases, *Col.* 2. 23. *Acts* 17. 30.) I mean, that shew, which they have of humility and self-denial, and honouring Gods free grace and the merits of Christs. The causelesness of this

this jealousy I shall take occasion to discover, in answer to one Question or other, which for that end shall be proposed in the sequel of this Discourse. In the mean time for the preventing, or removing of such causeless jealousies in the case before us, it may be sufficient to commend to observation that 22d Canon of the most excellent *Glassius* in his *Philologia Sacra de verbo*, p. 586. *Activa verba tribuuntur illis, quæ non propriissime, & influxu proximo id agunt, quod verba significant, sed certâ tantum ratione concurrunt. Sometimes matters, or effects are in Scripture ascribed to those things, which are no principal causes thereof, but onely instruments under God, yea which are no cause at all thereof* [*strictly so called,*] *but onely in means or conditions in one sort or other, concurring to the matter.* It were easie to multiply instances of this kind, besides those which are specified by the said expert Linguist and learned Author. Thus is *Timothy* by his life and doctrine said to save Himself and his Hearers, 1 *Tim.* 4. 16. And sinners are said to make themselves new hearts and new spirits, *Ezek.* 18. last. Thus is baptisme *i.e.* the answer of a good conscience towards God, said to save us, 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. Not that this Renovation [the thing meant by the answer of a good conscience towards God] is so much as a cause (in propriety of speech) thereof, but because it doth *suo modo*, or *quadam ratione*, in some sort morally concur thereunto, *i. e.* as a certain means, or condition of a sinners salvation, at least by divine order and appointment extrinsecal thereunto. Where by the way be it observed,

1. That S. *Peter* thought it no derogating from the grace of God, or merits of Christ, to attribute our salvation to the answer of a good con-

conſcience toward God, *i. e.* to real holineſs. In like ſort there is no juſt cauſe to think, that the adſcription of a ſinners righteouſneſs, juſtification, or remiſſion of ſin to his faith properly taken, is any ſinful arrogating to our ſelves, or derogating from God, and Chriſt.

2. Be it obſerved, that this ſame jealouſy, being given way unto, muſt neceſſarily cauſe us to make ſome ſuch ſtrange conſtruction of that expreſſion of S. *Peter* (the anſwer of a good conſcience towards God) how that by it is not meant the anſwer of a good conſcience towards God, but God himſelf, who alone doth ſave us, and by whoſe free grace ſinners are ſaved.

3 Another cauſe of the ſaid miſ-interpretation, as I judge, is, becauſe it is in appearance full of comfort, and as ſuch by too too many ſwallowed down even as the marrow and fatneſs of the Goſpel, as if this were that feaſt of fat things, that feaſt of wines on the lees, of fat things full marrow foretold by the Prophet *Iſaiah* chap. 25. 6. This indeed is a moſt woful calamity, that the true comforts of Scripture are with the moſt of ſinners, ſo ſmall, as that they are not at all affected therewith, and that when the Miniſters of God do mourn to them *i. e.* do denounce the threatnings of God againſt them, they will not lament, nor when they pipe, *i. e.* proclaim to them the comfortable doctrines of the Goſpel, they will not dance. But if we pipe and preach ſuch doctrines as theſe [in ſhew and appearance to a fleſhly eye moſt comfortable] That Jeſus Chriſt hath done all for our ſalvation, and we have nothing to do for that end, That it is the righteouſneſs of Chriſt himſelf, that is imputed to us for righteouſneſs, nothing that is done

done by our selves is capable of any imputation in order to that end: this is the piping and preaching, which makes sinners dance; but alas they dance to the musick of a Syren, a Doctrine that charms them onely to destroy them; for although while they live it may bear them up in their sins, against the natural temper of their own consciences, yet for certain in the end it will leave them desperate and miserable.

4. Another cause of the said mis interpretation of the word (faith) is, as I am perswaded, the not understanding the nature of Gospel justification, they misconceiving,

1. That by it a sinner is freed, not onely from guilt of punishment, but also from guilt of fault; which errour hath been at large refuted in the first part of this discourse.

2. They falsly supposing, That justification doth consist of two integral parts, whereof, say they, Remission of sin is one, and the imputation of Christs righteousness, or Christs righteousness it self imputed (for so some do expresse the matter) is the other; and they do usually say (as doth Dr *Owen* and Dr *Grews* Sermons upon *Jer.* 23. 6. p. 55.) that we have the one from Christs passive, and the other from his active obedience, upon which latter account onely (as to me seemeth) Dr *Grew* would have him to be called, The Lord our righteousness. Whereas the truth is, that Christs righteousness however it be the meritorious cause, yet it is no part at all of a sinners justification; yea because it is the meritorious cause, and a thing for that reason wholly extrinsecal to it (for so are all efficient causes to their effects) it cannot therefore be any part of justification it self, remission of

sin

ſin being it, that doth *Totam naturam juſtificationis Evangelicæ abſorbere, i. e,* doth wholly conſtitute juſtification (I mean, that juſtification, which was merited by Chriſt, and promiſed by God to believing ſinners, or to ſinners conditionally, upon their ſincere believing) and that it ſelf is *Ipſa juſtitia imputata, seu donata*, that very righteouſneſs, which is ſaid in Scripture to be imputed, or imparted to believing ſinners, and that faith it ſelf is the very thing, which is imputed to them *in hanc*, or *ad hanc juſtitiam*, to, or for this righteouſneſs. Nor do I think it a thing more to be doubted, that by faith is meant faith in that ſo oft repeated ſaying of the Apoſtle (Faith is imputed to us for righteouſneſs) than that by Believing is meant Believing in that his ſaying, *With the heart man believeth unto righteouſneſs, Rom.* 10. 10.

There be other cauſes, or occaſions at leaſt of the ſaid miſ-interpretation of the word (Faith) uſeful to be known; but becauſe I have enlarged my ſelf beyond my firſt intention upon thoſe already intimated, I ſhall forbear to lengthen this Chapter by the addition of any other, but ſhall proceed to the Anſwer of ſome other Queſtion pertaining to the matter in hand, which will be the Subject of the next Chapter.

CHAP.

CHAP. XVIII.

Q. *What is it for Faith* [*the thing it self Faith*] *to be imputed to Believers for Righteousness?* Answ. *There being a twofold righteousness,* viz. *Legal* [*commanded in the law of works, or innocency,*] *and evangelical* (*promised in the law of faith;*) *and there being also a difference betwixt these two sayings* (*Faith is imputed to us* ἀντὶ δικαιοσύνης, *instead of righteousness, and* εἰς δικαιοσύνην, *To righteousness, this being the Apostles literal expression of the matter;*) *it is thereupon declared, How faith may be truly conceived and asserted to be imputed to believing sinners, both To Righteousness and instead of Righteousness. The Authors humble opinion touching the genuine sense of the phrase, and the reasons thereof rendred.*

HAving manifested in the foregoing Chapters, that faith is expressly said to be imputed to us for righteousness, and that by faith so said to be imputed, is meant faith it self in the propriety of the word, and having withall declared the main causes, or occasions of the contrary misconstruction, as if by faith were meant

meant the righteousnes of Christ [the object of faith,] I shall next put it to the Question (the matter being now ripe for it.)

Quest. *What is it for faith to be imputed to a Believer for righteousnes?*

Answ. According to a twofold sense of the word (righteousnes,) so a twofold construction may possibly and agreeably both to reason and to the truth of Scripture, be made of the said phrase, *e. g.* There is a twofold righteousnes, which in modern Authors is usually for distinction sake expressed by the name of Legal and Evangelical; by the former is meant obedience absolutely perfect, such as that, which was made the condition of the covenant of works or innocency, and by the latter is here meant not that righteousnes, which is commanded in the Gospel (although this must be acknowledged to be one kind, or branch of a sinners Gospel-righteousnes and therefore fitly called Evangelical) but that righteousnes, which is promised in the Gospel upon condition of the righteousnes therein commanded, these two branches of a sinners Evangelical righteousnes differing the one from the other (as hath by occasion been before said) as *Officium, & Beneficium*, as Mans duty, and Gods mercy, mans duty consisting in the former, and his felicity in the latter; that having the nature, and to be therefore conceived under the notion of a means, and this of an end, to which that means doth (I do not say efficiently, but) effectually conduce.

Now (to apply the said distinction of a twofold righteousnes to the matter in hand) if we take the word Righteousnes for Legal righte-

ouſneſs, it may be well and truly ſaid, That faith it ſelf is imputed to believing ſinners, *Vice*, or in *Loco*, inſtead of the ſaid Legal righteouſneſs, *i. e.* faith doth ſtand a believing ſinner in a like ſaving ſtead, or is available to a like ſaving purpoſe unto him, as the ſaid Legal righteouſneſs would have done, or been, if man had never become a ſinner. This being a ſafe and true conſtruction, I ſhall for the clearing thereof, and for the prevention of miſtake commend to conſideration, how the phraſe of accounting, imputing, or reckoning is taken in certain other Scriptures (apt for the purpoſe in hand) it being there uſed to manifeſt the accepting of one thing for another, or to the like purpoſe as if it were another, for which ſee *Num.* 18.27. where the Levites heave-offering is promiſed to be reckoned, counted, or imputed to them, as though it were the corn of the threſhing floor, and as the fulneſs of the winepreſs; and ver. 30. Where God ſpeaks to the ſame purpoſe concerning their gifts, as was ſaid of the heave-offering of their tithes (*When you have heaved the beſt thereof from it, then it ſhall be counted unto the Levites as the increaſe of the threſhing floor and as the increaſe of the wine-preſs.*)

Queſt. *How, or in what ſenſe was it thus accounted, or promiſed to be ſo accounted?*

Anſw. Not that the ſaid heave-offering was judged, eſteemed, or ſimply thought to be the very corn of the threſhing-floor, or the very full fruit of the vine. Not ſo: for as the Papiſts by making uſe of any of their three ſenſes (taſting, feeling, ſeeing) may unerringly know, that the conſecrated bread in the Lords ſupper (by them commonly called the Hoſt) is not *Ipſum Corpus*, the

the very body of Christ, so might the Levites by their eye-sight have perceived the contrary, *viz.* That the heave-offering of both those kinds of tithes, which by divine law were made due from them to the Priests, was not the very corn of the threshing floor, and the very fruit of the vine: But the meaning is (as the learned do interpret it, and which indeed is an interpretation obvious) it shall be alike acceptable to God and available to the like purpose, as if it had been of their own proper fields, or vineyards. In like sort may the imputation of faith to Believers for Righteousness (the said Legal righteousness) be truly and safely understood,

1. Negatively, not that God doth account, or reckon faith to be that, which in it self it is not, or to be any other thing, than in its true nature and in very deed it is, *e. g.* (To speak more punctually)

1. Not that God doth account, or repute it to be our very fulfilling the law of innocency, whether in our own persons, or in Christ: for as Christ by fulfilling the law did satisfie for our sin, so by fulfilling it himself (I mean the whole law of Mediatorship, whereof the law, that obliged us, was one material part, and which he did fulfill not in our persons, but in his own as Mediator for us) he did merit, that no such fulfilling of the law should be required of us in order to the attaining of righteousness. Thence that saying of the Apostle, *God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself*, 2 *Cor.* 5. 19. Where it is observable that St. *Paul* says not, We were in Christ reconciling our selves to God; which yet he might have said, yea and more might he have said, *viz.* We were in Christ reconciling the

world to God, if it were one, That we in Christ fulfil the law. I conclude therefore, that as by faith is not meant Christ, or his righteousnes, so neither by Gods imputing faith to us for righteousnes is it meant, that our faith is reputed by God to be *ipsa legis impletio*, our legal righteousnes, *i.e.* our fulfilling of the law of innocency, whether in our own persons, or in and by Christ.

2. Not, that God doth reckon, or account our faith it self to be absolutely perfect, or without any the least sinful defect: for such is not the faith of any Believer, the best of all, though being able to say with him in the Gospel (Lord I believe) yet having need with him also to pray, Lord help, yea and the Lord pardon my unbelief. If such a perfection of faith had been made the condition of a sinners righteousnes or justification in the sight of God, what man living had been justified? But our Christian comfort is, That the promise of righteousnes by faith is made to the reality, or sincerity, not to the perfection thereof. So that as God cannot account our imperfect faith to be perfect (for this is repugnant to his nature, and his judgment is never otherwise than according to truth:) so we have no need, that he should do so, because the law of faith requires no such perfection of faith to the foresaid end, or as the condition of our justification.

3. Not, that God doth repute faith to be of that intrinsecal value, worth or merit, as the perfect fulfilling of the law of innocency would have been, or as if it would serve to the self same end and purpose, I mean, to the self same kind of righteousnes, or justification.

Not

Not ſo I ſay: for if man had continued in innocency, he ſhould and would have been juſtified for that his innocency, or perfect obedience, and this would have been the meritorious cauſe of that; ſo that this his juſtification would not have been,

1. Gratuitous, and for the righteouſneſs ſake of Chriſt.

2. It would have been a juſtification of another kind, than that of ſinners by faith in Chriſt, *i.e.* It would have been a juſtification, *A reatu culpæ*, from guilt of fault, whereas the juſtification of a ſinner onely is, yea can be *A reatu pœnæ*, from guilt of puniſhment, not from the guilt of fault ſimply and abſolutely, *i. e.* from the guilt of all, or all manner of faults.

2. Affirmatively I make anſwer, That faith may be truly ſaid to be imputed to us for Legal righteouſneſs, becauſe it is promiſed by God, in ſome certain ſenſe to be reckoned to them, as though it were; even as the heave-offering of the tithe was promiſed by him to be reckoned to the Levite, as though it were the corn of the threſhing floor and the increaſe of the winepreſs (that is) that it ſhall be accepted with God, and prove alike available to the ſalvation of a ſinner, as a Legal righteouſneſs conſiſting in perfect obedience would have been to the ſalvation of an innocent man; That as a Legal righteouſneſs ſhould, and would have availed a perſon innocent to juſtification from guilt of fault, ſo faith in Chriſt ſhall avail a believing ſinner to juſtification from guilt of puniſhment, this being fully anſwerable to a ſinners neceſſity and hearts deſire.

Briefly, Gods reckoning faith unto us instead of a Legal righteousnes is in plain sense and construction Gods looking upon a sinner, who truly believeth, with as much grace and favour, and his dealing with him as graciously and bountifully (so far as concerns his eternal salvation) as if he were a man of perfect righteousnes, and had entirely fulfilled the whole law.

I shall somewhat further exemplifie the truth of what hath been here asserted by this familiar instance, As a Creditor upon a promise made to accept from a Debtor a penny in a shilling, or twelve pence instead of a pound legally due to him, may be said to reckon it (being paid) to the Debtor, as if it were the full payment of the whole sum due by law, or to count that as paid, which in strict construction according to law was not paid, but of courtesie according to promise is remitted; even so I can perceive no reason, why it may not be with safety of truth and with fitnes of expression said, that God imputeth faith to believing sinners for legal righteousnes, in that he doth accept it in its stead, *i. e.* doth deal with them as if they were perfectly righteous, pardoning all their unrighteousnesses, and acquitting them from all that punishment, whereunto upon that account they were obnoxious. The Apostle oft times saying [*We are justifyed by faith*] doth give us to understand, that we are some way or other justified by it, and the way of its justifying he says, is by imputation, or account from God for righteousnes, which imputation of faith may well and truly be asserted, because it is all that God requires of men to their justification instead of the perfect righteousness of the law. Hitherto I have spoken of

the

the meaning of the phraſe (Gods imputing faith to us for righteouſneſs) upon a rational ſuppoſition, that by righteouſneſs is meant legal righteouſneſs, and ſuppoſing that by [for] is meant (inſtead) in which ſenſe the word (for) ſeems to be taken in *Exod.* 13.9. where it is ſaid, That the paſchal ſolemnity ſhould be for a ſign to them upon their hand, and for a memorial between their eyes, *i.e.* it ſhould be inſtead of ſuch ſigns and memorials, as men uſe to carry about them to preſerve, or renew the remembrance of any thing.

I ſhall now proceed to ſpecifie another ſafe conſtruction of the phraſe on ſuppoſition, that by righteouſneſs is meant Evangelical righteouſneſs.

2. By that righteouſneſs, for which faith is ſaid to be imputed, moſt probably is meant that Evangelical righteouſneſs, which is promiſed in the Goſpel to believing ſinners, and which is ſtyled in Scripture (as hath been already ſaid and proved) the righteouſneſs of faith, and which is of God by faith. My reaſons for this conſtruction are ſuch as theſe,

1. Becauſe his words in the original are not ἀντὶ δικαιοσύνης, inſtead of righteouſneſs (this particle properly ſignifying *Vicem*, inſtead) but εἰς δικαιοσύνην, unto, or into righteouſneſs. And thus it is literally rendred by ſeveral Authors; *In juſtitiam*, into righteouſneſs (ſays *Calvin*) *Ad juſtitiam*, unto righteouſneſs, ſays *Piſcator*. I grant indeed, that St. *Paul* in his expreſſion (εἰς δικαιοσύνην) doth follow the *Septuagint*, as was uſual with him and the reſt of the Apoſtles, together with our bleſſed Saviour, in their quotations from the old Teſtament: for in the Hebrew,

Gen. 15. 6. (Whence that ſentence is quoted by the Apoſtle) it is not ſaid explicitly, that *Abrahams* faith was accounted to him, either for, or to, or into righteouſneſs, but ſimply without any prepoſition particle, Righteouſneſs. Nevertheleſs the Apoſtle did warrantably follow the *Septuagints* Tranſlation of the ſaid Text in *Gen.* 15. 16.

1. Becauſe the particle, or letter (*Lamed*) is in ſome other Scriptures wanting, where neceſſarily it is to be underſtood, an inſtance of which defect that great Rabbi, Mr *H. Ainſworth* doth ſpecifie, *viz. Lebeith in the houſe, Jer.* 52. 17. is written onely *Beith. 2 King.* 25. 13.

2. Becauſe the ſaid letter (*Lamed*) is in another Scripture (*viz. Pſal.* 106. 31.) prefixed to the word Righteouſneſs, where the act of *Phineas* is ſaid to be counted to him for righteouſneſs.

Now although our Tranſlators (together with *Beza* and others in their Latine Tranſlation of the New Teſtament) do render the particle [εἰς] not to, but for, as alſo doth the Genevah tranſlation, nevertheleſs we may not neceſſarily conclude from thence, that they would have the particle (Pro, or For) to be underſtood in the ſame ſenſe as ἀντὶ, inſtead, as if it had been ſaid, Inſtead of righteouſneſs: for it is ordinary with our Tranſlators to render the ſaid particle (εἰς) by the word (for) in many Scriptures, where the word (for) cannot in reaſon be underſtood in ſuch a conſtruction as is evident by the following Texts *Acts* 3. 38. (*Repent and be baptized* εἰς ἄφεσιν *for the remiſſion of your ſins*) And *Heb.* 11. 7. Where *Noah* is ſaid to have prepared an Ark εἰς σωτηρίαν for the ſaving of his houſe, So *Luke* 3. 3.

Where

Where *John* the Baptiſt is ſaid to have come into all the countrey about *Jordan*, preaching the baptiſm of repentance εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, for the remiſſion of ſins.

2. I am much aſſured; that by righteouſneſs in the ſaid ſentence of the Apoſtle concerning Gods imputing faith to, or for righteouſneſs is not meant Legal, but Evangelical righteouſneſs, becauſe for a ſinner to be juſtified by faith and for his faith to be imputed to him to, or for righteouſneſs, are phraſes equivalent and of the ſelf ſame importance, they being promiſcuouſly uſed by the Apoſtle, as was before ſaid: for he proves the juſtification of a ſinner to be by faith without legal works from the witneſs of Scripture touching the manner or means of *Abrahams* juſtification, wherein it is teſtified That *Abraham* believed God, *i. e.* without the ſaid works of the law, and that his faith was accounted, or imputed to him for righteouſneſs.

3. Becauſe there is no other kind of juſtification, or righteouſneſs promiſed in the Goſpel to ſinners upon their faith in Chriſt, or in God through Chriſt, than the ſaid Evangelical righteouſneſs, which conſiſts in the pardon of their ſins, they being not in a natural capacity of that other legal righteouſneſs, as hath been already ſaid upon occaſion more than once.

The premiſſes conſidered, I am perſwaded, that the genuine ſenſe of the Apoſtles saying, That God imputeth faith to a believer for, or to righteouſneſs is this, *viz.* That God doth accept of faith as the only requiſite condition of a ſinner being made righteous, *i. e.* of his being juſtified or pardoned for the ſake of Chriſt. Briefly, To ſay, that a ſinners faith is imputed to him for righteouſ-

teouſneſs is the ſelf ſame thing as to ſay in thoſe other words of the Apoſtle elſe where, That ſinners are juſtified by faith, or, That with the heart man believeth unto righteouſneſs, So that, he who underſtandeth rightly what is meant by faith or believing, and what by righteouſneſs in the ſaid aſſertions, and what it is to believe unto righteouſneſs, cannot but rightly know the meaning of every ſimple term in this propoſition (faith is imputed to us to righteouſneſs) and the true ſenſe of the propoſition it ſelf.

But becauſe various ways of expreſſing the ſame thing may not be altogether needleſs, but in many caſes, and as to many perſons uſeful rather, I ſhall, although ſtill to the ſame purpoſe, add,

Foraſmuch as there is a twofold righteouſneſs, the one commanded in the Goſpel, or law of faith (faith it ſelf being this Righteouſneſs and the *Ipſum Quod*, the thing it ſelf ſaid to be imputed by God) and the other in that law promiſed thereupon (juſtification, or remiſſion of ſin being this righteouſneſs, the *Ipſum ad Quod*, the thing to which it is imputed:) and foraſmuch as the righteouſneſs, which is commanded in the law of faith is that, which doth by Gods deſignation qualifie us for enjoying the righteouſneſs therein promiſed, it is faith, which by vertue of the promiſe doth intitle a ſinner to this promiſed righteouſneſs, which to ſay is all one as to ſay, A ſinners faith is imputed to him for, or unto righteouſneſs. Hereupon it is true alſo to ſay, That in the Goſpel of Chriſt the Righteouſneſs of God is revealed from faith to faith, *i. e.* from the righteouſneſs of faith therein commanded to the righteouſneſs, which is of faith, and is there-

in

in promiſed. This I ſay is a truth, and a commodious conſtruction of that ſaying, *Rom.* 1. 17. Let the genuine ſenſe of it prove, or be proved to be otherwiſe what it will, or can.

Having declared the true ſenſe and meaning of that ſaying (Faith is imputed to us for, or unto righteouſneſs) both of the ſimple terms, and of the entire propoſitions, I ſhall in the next place addreſs my diſcourſe to the clearing and diſentangling the true conſtruction thereof as aforeſaid, from ſuch objections as uſually are, or poſſibly may be made againſt it: And this I will do by the reſolution of ſeveral Queſtions, which will be the ſubject of certain Chapters next following.

CHAP.

CHAP. XIX.

Quest. *Upon what account, or from what cause, or causes is it, that faith (properly taken) is counted to Believers for righteousness, or proves to them effectually available unto righteousness?* Ans. *The Question is answered,* 1. *Negatively, Not* ab intrinseco, *from ought, which is in the intrinsecal nature of faith, or the value and merit thereof.* 2. *Affirmatively, The causes assigned being wholly* ab extrinseco, viz. *Gods mercy, Christs merit and the Gospel-covenant. Hereupon it is made apparent, that those Protestant Writers, who do assert faith it self to be imputed to Believers for or to righteousness, do not dethrone the righteousness of Christ, or set up any branch of mans own righteousness in its stead.*

Q. *Upon what account is it, that faith is accounted to us for righteousness, or proves to us effectually available for, or unto righteousness?*

Answ. 1. Negatively, The cause is not *Ab intrinseco, e. g.* 1. Not from any meritorious worth, that is in the grace of faith, or in any act, or work of ours therein comprized, name, or thing.

2. Not

2. Not meerly from any thing that is natural, or essential to it, or its peculiar actings, *viz.* the apprehending of Christ, the laying hold upon Christ and his righteousness and the like: for were there not some other cause of the thing here in Question, our believing, or laying hold on Christs righteousness (although his righteousness be a most enriching treasure, sufficient in it self and kind to enrich the whole world of sinners) would do us no good, or turn to any profit unto us, no more than a poor mans bare laying hands upon the gold and silver, which is in a rich mans bag, or chest, would enrich him.

2. Affirmatively, The cause, or causes thereof are wholly *ab extrinseco*, taken from what is extrinsecal to the essence, or nature of faith, *viz.* from God and Christ, and the Covenant of grace, and 1. The inward moving cause is Gods gracious good will and love and pleasure. *This is the will of him that sent me* (says our Saviour *Joh.* 6. 40) *that every one that seeth the Son, and believeth on him may have everlasting life*, See *Joh.* 3. 16.

2. Christs merit, or meritorious righteousness is the external impelling cause thereof. It is Christ, who died and by his bloodshed hath procured righteousness, or the justification of life for sinners upon their sincere faith, *Rom.* 5. 19. *As by the disobedience of one many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.* See both these causes (God free grace and Christs merit) expressed together, *Rom.* 3. 24, 25. *Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption, that is in Jesus Christ, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood*———

3. The Covenant of God and his fidelity thereupon

thereupon engaged to perform the ſame, is the cauſe why a ſinners faith is available unto righteouſneſs. God was pleaſed for Chriſts ſake to put his gracious purpoſe to pardon and juſtifie believing ſinners into a faithful promiſe, or covenant ſo to do, which promiſe, or covenant of God with ſinners concerning faith, is called the law of faith, *Rom.* 3. 27. And this law is that, which gives that force, efficacy, or power, which faith hath to our righteouſneſs, or juſtification. As ſin hath its ſtrength to condemn from one law (the law of works) 1 *Cor.* 5. 56. So faith hath its ſtrength to juſtifie and ſave from another, The law of faith, or covenant of grace. To this purpoſe are we taught (by thoſe words in the eleventh Article of our Church, ſaying, *We are accounted righteous before God, for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt by faith.* Where obſerve, that it is not ſaid, We are accounted righteous with his righteouſneſs, or merit, but for it by faith, *i. e.* the merit of Chriſt, or of his righteouſneſs hath ſo far prevailed with God, that by, or upon our faith we ſhall be accounted righteous before him; which is all one indeed as to ſay, That God for Chriſts merits ſake doth impute our faith to us for, or unto righteouſneſs, requiring no more at our hands for our juſtification in his ſight.

Theſe are the true cauſes (all of them extrinſecal to the preciſe nature of faith) of faith its being imputed to us for, or unto righteouſneſs, God thus effectually imputing it for his mercy and faithfulneſs ſake, and for his Chriſts ſake.

I have purpoſely propoſed, and anſwered this Queſtion, and reſerved a peculiar Chap. for it, for the more abundant ſatisfaction of many my diſ-

ſenting

senting Brethren, who will by no means allow faith in that saying (Faith is imputed to us for righteousnes) to be taken properly, *i. e.* for believing, but figuratively for the object of faith [Christs righteousnes,] they pretending, that the said propriety of construction doth derogate from the honour of Gods free grace and mercy, and from the merit of Christs righteousnes. But the foresaid answers to the Question in hand, do sufficiently manifest the vanity of such pretences: for what just cause of suspicion can there be, that we derogate from God and Christ, and arrogate to our selves and our own acts, in our asserting, That God doth impute our faith it self to us unto righteousnes, we withal openly declaring, that it is for his mercies sake and his son Christs sake, that he doth so? I desire therefore, that the foregoing Answers to the Question in hand may be the rather taken into consideration and remembred, because they may serve to discover, how causlesly those Protestant Writers, who maintain faith it self to be the thing imputed to sinners for righteousnes, are accused by their dissenting brethren, as if they did dethrone the righteousnes of Christ, and in the place thereof set up mans own righteousnes: for they do professedly and constantly maintain, that it is for the sake of Christs righteousnes, that this priviledge is indulged unto, and by divine promise entailed upon faith; And therefore be it known, That the brethren here impleaded do not thrust Christs righteousnes out of its due place, nor do they place mans righteousnes in its stead, although God hath designed (they still say) a proper place for it. The peculiar seat for Christs righteousnes is under

the

the head or title of a meritorious cause, and so long as we do reserve this honourable and eminent place for it, and it alone, we do preserve it *sartam tectam* in its throne of glory.

The matter by Gods gracious covenant for Christs sake being ordered, as aforesaid, What remains, but that upon consideration of this his divine and merciful disposition, we do make acclamation, saying (as of old in another case, *Zech.* 4. 7.) Grace, Grace unto it? What remains, but that we utter forth the high praises of God and Christ in words like those of *David*, 2 *Sam.* 7. 20, 21. And what can we poor sinners say more? for thy words sake, and according to thine own heart hast thou done this great thing, this wonder of goodness, and free favour? What remains, but that we breath forth our thanksgiving to God in the words of our Saviour, *Mat.* 11. 25. *We thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth*, that whereas the Devil and his Angels can have righteousness imputed to them upon no terms, being left hopeless in their unrighteousness, thou hast graciously promised for Christs sake to impute to sinful men their faith for righteousness, Even so, O Father, because it seemed good in thine eyes? What remains, but that as *Scipio Africanus* being arraigned before the *Roman* Senators, as having done dis-service to the Commonwealth, did call them away from the Senate-house (the place of judicature) to the Temple, there to sacrifice to the Gods for the victories obtained by his conduct, In like sort that I bespeak, and beseech my dissenting brethren, that they would cease all that quarrelling, which they have taken up against faith it self, its being imputed to sinners for

righte-

righteousnes, and that they would let fall that suit, which they have causlesly commenced against their Brethren upon the score aforesaid, charging them as back-friends to the merits of Christ and freedom of divine grace, and that instead of farther contendings in this needless quarrel, we all would unanimously hasten to build an altar and there sacrifice the sacrifices of thanksgiving, saying as did the multitude of that heavenly Chorus, *Glory be to God on high, on earth peace, good will towards men,* Luke 2. 14.

CHAP. XX.

Q. *Can ought, that is imperfect, possibly be by God imputed to a sinner for, or to righteousness?* Answ. *Yes. The Authors professed dissent herein from certain other Brethren, whereof two only by name are instanced in, whose words are recited, and a reply made thereunto.*

Q. *Can ought, that is imperfect, possibly be by God imputed to a sinner for righteousness?*

Answ. Yes. God forbid, that it should be otherwise. There be many indeed, who do affect the impossibility of this thing, and upon that mistake they have perverted, as is before expressed, the meaning of the Apostle in that saying of his so oft inculcated by him (Faith is imputed to us for righteousness:) among whom I shall onely in this Chapter instance in two, Dr *Andrew Ryvet*, and Dr *Obadiah Grew*, and having recited their words shall reply thereunto.

Novimus (says Dr *Andrew Ryvet* in his Exercitations upon *Genesis*, p. 400) *nihil adeo nobis imputari ad justitiam, quod vere, & perfecte justitia non sit* —— *We know, that nothing is imputed by God to righteousness, which is not truly and perfectly a righteousness, therefore if faith be not a perfect righteousness, it cannot* Adeo haberi, *be by God accounted or imputed for righteousness.*

But

But (*pace tanti viri*) 1. Why may not a ſincere faith be made by God the condition of Gods imputing, or imparting righteouſneſs to ſinners, *i. e.* of juſtifying them, or conſtituting them righteous for Chriſts righteouſneſs ſake, and thereupon ſo reputing them as well as faith in perfection? Why may not God make a ſincere faith available, and count it as available to all ſaving purpoſes, as a perfect faith? I mean, Why may not God reward the one, as well as the other with righteouſneſs? Is the Lords hand ſhortned, that he cannot? or are his bowels ſtraitned, that he will not ſave, juſtifie, or make righteous a ſinner without a faith abſolutely perfect? With God, ſays the Archangel to the bleſſed Virgin, nothing is unpoſſible, *Luke* 1. 37. and to ſay that this is (to my ſeeming) a conſtructive denial of Gods power to pardon the ſinful imperfection of our good duties, or (to ſpeak in the language of Scripture) to take away the iniquity of our Holy things: for if God doth pardon the imperfection of our faith, or of any other our graces, ſurely it ought not to be denied, that God doth *Eodem loco habere*, account, or reckon them to the ſinner, as if they were perfect. Yea, God having in his law of grace, or act of oblivion (as will be ſaid in another Chapter) conſtituted a ſincere faith, however otherwiſe imperfect, the condition of our attaining Righteouſneſs, how can it be otherwiſe, but that God (who cannot deny himſelf) ſhould according to his promiſe *Eodem loco habere*, account it to the ſinner as perfect, *i. e.* reward it with righteouſneſs?

2. I anſwer *Ex abundanti*, That true faith, *i. e.* ſuch as S. *James* ſays, is made perfect by works,

although as a moral vertue, or a grace of Gods ſpirit it be imperfect, and although the works, whereby it is ſaid by S. *James* to be made perfect, be in themſelves imperfect, nevertheleſs is in another ſenſe (very fit to the purpoſe in hand) moſt perfect, *viz. In ſenſu Legali, civili*, or *In genere medii, i. e.* as it is the conſtituted condition of a ſinners juſtification, it is *Vere, & perfecte juſtitia* (to ſpeak in our Authors own words) both truly and perfectly a righteouſneſs, and accounted by God no otherwiſe, than in truth it is: for it is *Tota conditio*, the whole condition. Yea I will ſay (the word, Faith, being rightly, and in its due latitude underſtood according to the full importance thereof as frequently uſed in Scripture) it is the whole of that condition, which God doth now require of ſinners by the law of Faith, in order to the obtaining of that righteouſneſs, which is ſaid to be by Faith without Works. Now be it impartially conſidered, what hinders, that a thing imperfect in it ſelf, yet being perfectly the full of all that God requires for ſuch and ſuch ends and purpoſes, ſhould by God be eſteemed, reckoned, or imputed, as if it were in it ſelf perfect? Whereas therefore it is the ſaying of this learned Author, that faith properly taken *Nec eſt juſtitia, nec juſtitia loco habetur*, I cannot but upon account of the premiſſes think, and ſay the contrary, *viz.* That faith is truly of its kind a righteouſneſs (it being commanded in the law of Faith and ſtyled therefore by our Saviour *the work of God, John* 6. 29.) and that it is imputed for, or to that righteouſneſs, which is therein promiſed, ſo that we may not onely with ſafety, but we muſt alſo of neceſſity ſay, if we mean to ſpeak the truth, That

fides

fides & est justitia, & justitiæ loco habetur, and this with a *non Obstante* to any imperfection of faith, provided it be sincere.

Thus I have endeavoured to remove that great stumbling block out of the way of truth, which occasioned this Author to turn aside from it in his mis-exposition of that saying of the Apostle.

I shall in the next place reply to a few passages out of Dr. *Grew*, in his Sermons on *Jer.* 23, 6.

In *p.* 51. as he reasons against the imputation of the *vi credere*, because it is imperfect, so his words are *p.* 38. *The righteousness which justifies a sinner, is not in, or of himself in any gracious dispositions in him, or acts done by him, because being imperfect they are unable to justifie, but it is the righteousness of another, yet by grace and favour accounted his.*

Answ. 1. It is falsly supposed by this Doctor, that there is any righteousness, which a sinner hath of himself: for although it be truly presumed, that there is a righteousness, which a sinner hath in himself, nevertheless it is not asserted by any Authors (for ought I know, or ever heard of) that this righteousness is of himself. And it is uncharitably here insinuated by the Doctor, that there are some, who do maintain, that there is a righteousness, which a sinner hath of himself, and that this righteousness will justifie him, for none are so senseless, as to assert, that ought, which is not, can justifie.

2. Though the righteousness, which doth justifie a sinner *per modum meriti*, *i. e.* doth merit his justification, be the righteousness of another, nevertheless a personal righteousness, which

consisteth in certain gracious dispositions in a sinner, and acts done by him, may be made of God the condition of a sinners justification for the merits sake of Christs righteousnes.

3. Although these gracious dispositions and acts done by a sinner are not able because of their imperfections to justifie him from guilt of fault, or as one legally righteous, *i. e.* as no sinner, nevertheless their imperfection hinders not, but that through the mercy of God in Christ promised in the Gospel, a sinner may thereupon be justified, or absolved from guilt of punishment, they being by God required of every sinner in order thereunto.

4 Gods grace and favour doth not consist (as this Author and other much mistaken Brethren would have it) in reputing, or accepting Christs righteousnes to be ours, but in accepting it as a valuable consideration, whereupon to pardon, or justifie us through faith in him, and in his conferring upon us those saving effects, and benefits, which were purchased by that his righteousnes.

And whereas the Doctor says, *p.* 45. *Mens repentings makes them not righteous before God. O take heed of setting sorrow for sin in Christs room.*

I answer, 1. Mens repentings and sorrow for their sins are a part of that Evangelical righteousnes, which in the law of grace is required of sinners in order to their being made righteous, or justified, *i. e.* this being that righteousnes, which for the righteousnes sake of Christ God hath promised in the Gospel to penitent sinners, which for that cause in the name of Christ is by

the

the Miniſters of Chriſt to be preached to all and every ſinner.

2. To maintain repentance and godly ſorrow for ſin to be a requiſite condition in order as aforeſaid, is not to ſet it in Chriſts room (as this Doctor here in ſeveral places of his Sermons doth odiouſly and erroneouſly inſinuate) nor in any other room, or place, than where Chriſt himſelf by his law of grace hath ſet, and ſettled it.

3. Hereupon I ſhall in the way of caution and admonition to the Doctor himſelf, and all thoſe who are taught by him, and to all ſuch Teachers, ſay, O take heed, Sirs, of ſetting Chriſt in the room of repentance, as *Saltmarſh*, and divers others have done to the deſtruction of ſouls, it being alike hazardous to ſet Chriſt in the room of repentance, as to ſet repentance in the room of Chriſt: for as repentance will not ſupply Chriſts room, ſo nor will Chriſt ſupply the vacant room of repentance, it being as well impoſſible for a ſinner to be ſaved without repentance, as for a penitent ſinner to be ſaved without Chriſt: As repentance without Chriſt cannot; ſo Chriſt without repentance will not ſave a ſinner. This we may and ought to believe; for he hath told us over and over, *That except we repent, we ſhall all periſh, his righteouſneſs notwithſtanding*, Luke 13. 3, 5.

Of any Author almoſt that ever I read, this Dr ſeems to me to have need of the ſaid Caution (O take heed) This I ſay ſeems to me by many dangerouſly ſeducing paſſages diſperſed in his Book, he ſaying (p. 173.) *Some will not venture their ſouls on Chriſt alone, they will have two ſtrings to their bow, ſomething of their own, at leaſt for a re-*

ſerve, and dead lift. Theſe he reſembles (in the following page) *to that harlot, who would have had the the living child divided, ſaying, They would have their juſtification before God to be parted betwixt Chriſt righteouſneſs and their own.* And ſays he p. 200. *A ſinner needs no more than Chriſts righteouſneſs to juſtifie him in the ſight of God.* Many other paſſages there be in his Sermons to this purpoſe, which forbearing here to relate, I ſhall in few words reply to theſe forecited.

1. No wiſe adventurers will adventure their ſouls on Chriſt alone without repentance for their ſins: for if they do, they will be ſure to loſe their venture: for Chriſt will ſave no impenitent ſinner, who although he may hope in Chriſt, and after a faſhion put his truſt in Chriſt, yet he and his hope ſhall periſh, Nor would Chriſt have any ſinner to make a fool of himſelf by thinking otherwiſe, he having told us all, what we are to truſt unto in that forecited text, *Luke* 13. 3, 5. And yet alas! how many foolhardy Adventurers are there in the world, who will adventure their all in all (I mean) their ſouls ſalvation upon Chriſt alone without repentance? Such fooliſh adventurers were thoſe, whom Chriſt ſpeaks of in *Mat.* 7. 22. who in their impenitency venturing their ſouls upon Chriſt alone, or upon naked Chriſt, according to the late deviſed phraſe in the Books of certain popular Preachers, our Saviour there reſembles to that fooliſh man, who built his houſe upon the ſand, which when the floods came and the winds blew, and did beat upon it, fell with a vengeance.

2. Although ſinners are to venture their ſouls upon Chriſt alone as one that hath done his own

part,

part, *i. e.* hath finished the work, which God gave him to do, whereby to merit their salvation, conditionally upon their return to God by Faith and Repentance to be confered upon them, nevertheless they are not to venture their souls upon Christ for the doing of their own work, *i. e.* which God hath impoſed upon them in order to the saving of their own souls. It is mad venturing further than Christ would have us to venture.

3. Forasmuch as Christ would have no sinner to adventure his soul upon him without repentance for his sins, it did ill become this Author in a kind of a gibing fashion (as is obvious to be construed) to say of those, who dare not be so fool-hardy as to run such a desperate venture, That they would have two strings to their bow.

4. Although a sinner needs no more than Christs righteousnes for the satisfaction of Gods justice, for the expiation of his sin, or for meriting his justification upon terms revealed in the Gospel, nevertheless that a sinner may be actually justified in the sight of God, there is more needfull than Christs righteousnes: for to this end he needs that righteousnes, of which our Saviour Christ says, *Except your righteousnes exceed the righteousnes of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven.* Although a sinner needs nothing in co-ordination with Christs righteousnes to justifie him before God, yet in subordination thereunto he doth need a personal, or evangelical righteousnes, which consisteth summarily in repentance towards God, and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ, of which see more at large in Chap. 12. p. 39. 40.-- If the Publican had not repented, he had not departed

parted to his house justified. So that if the Dr. be minded to make others, or himself merry by calling Christs righteousness and a sinners repentance two strings, I shall endeavour to spoil the sport by retorting the common Proverb, which as to the purpose in hand is very considerable and applicable, [It is wisdome to have two strings to ones bow:] He will prove himself at last to be no wise Bowman, who shall trust to the single string of Christs righteousness without the said personal righteousness, which consists in a sinners repentance towards God and Faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ; which if he doth, he will be sure to miss the Mark he aims at, I mean, justification, or remission of sin, or (to speak in the language of the Apostle) the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus.

But I do assuredly hope, that the Citizens of *Coventry* are much wiser men, than Dr *Grew* took them, and taught them to be; at least I cannot but take notice what great need some people have to pray, that God would make them wise as *David*, *i. e.* wiser than their Teachers.

5. To assert the necessity of the said personal righteousness in order to a sinners justification in the sight of God, is not to part our justification betwixt Christs righteousness and our own (as this Author doth ignorantly and odiously word the matter) that is, It is not to ascribe one part of our justification to Christs righteousness, and another part thereof to our own, nor is it either in whole, or in the least part to ascribe our justification to our own righteousness under any such notion, or respect as to the righteousness of Christ, but it is in truth to ascribe the whole of our Justification to Christs righteous-

ness

neſs as the meritorious cauſe, whereby alone it was purchaſed, and to our own evangelical righteouſneſs as the condition, upon which according to Gods gracious promiſe in Chriſt, it is to be actually enjoyed, and without which it cannot be had. He, that ſays, That Chriſt by his righteouſneſs doth deliver the ſouls of ſinners, yet ſays withall (as doth the Prophet *Ezekiel*, ch. 14. 14.) that ſinners do deliver their ſouls by their own righteouſneſs, cannot be juſtly charged for parting their ſouls ſalvation betwixt Chriſts righteouſneſs and mans own: for in ſo ſaying he doth attribute his whole ſalvation to both, yet under ſuch different notions, habitudes, or reſpects (rationally to be underſtood) as are peculiar to each, *i. e.* to Chriſts righteouſneſs as the meritorious cauſe, and to a ſinners own righteouſneſs, only as to the condition, but no cauſe at all thereof, as partly hath been already ſaid, and will be more at large declared by way of anſwer to a Queſtion, which will be the ſubject of the following Chapter.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXI.

Q. *Under what notion, ſpecifical* conceptus, *or formal conſideration is faith (properly taken) imputed to ſinners for, or to righteouſneſs?* Anſw. *The Queſtion is anſwered at large clearly and diſtinctly* i. e. *both Negatively and Affirmatively. An objection anſwered.*

Q. *Under what notion, ſpecifical* conceptus, *or conſideration is faith it ſelf imputed to ſinners for, or to Righteouſneſs?*

Anſw. 1. Negatively (beſides what hath been by occaſion already ſaid *chap.* 18. and 19. I add) That faith is not ſo imputed to us as it is a moral vertue, or grace of Gods holy Spirit, or as it acts in a peculiar manner in relying, laying hold upon, apprehending, or applying to our ſelves the righteouſneſs of Chriſt, the object of this faith: for, 1. Chriſts righteouſneſs is not propoſed to our faith in order to our juſtification meerly as an object to be apprehended, or relyed upon, nor is righteouſneſs, or juſtification promiſed to faith preciſely as it acts by way of apprehending, or laying hold upon Chriſts righteouſneſs: for nothing is more apparent both by Scripture, and ſad experience, than that many wicked perſons going on in a wilful courſe of ſin do act faith ſo far forth as to apprehend, lay hold

hold upon, or lean themselves on the righteousness of Christ; nor otherwise is it easily, if at all conceivable, how a professed Christian should be guilty of that sin, which we call Presumption, did he not lean upon Christs righteousness to be saved by it, or him.

2. The object of justifying Faith as justifying, is not simply the righteousness of Christ by Faith to be rested, and relied upon, but Christ himself in person to be by our faith accepted, or received as our Saviour and Governour, or (as we do usually express the matter) to be received in all his offices, both as Prophet, Priest and King, this being that reception, or acceptation of Christs to which the saving benefits of justification, remission of sin, and adoption are promised in the Gospel, *John.* 1. 11, 12.

3. As for that unscriptural phrase in great vogue (applying Christs righteousness to our selves) I humbly conceive,

1. That Christs righteousness is not in it self at all imputed, imparted, or applyed to us, otherwise than in the saving effects and benefits procured by it.

2. The application of Christs righteousness to us in this true construction of the phrase, is not any act of Faith, but it is the act of God consequent to, or upon our Faith: for this application of Christs righteousness to us in the saving effects thereof being all one with the collation of them upon us, it is God himself, I say, who according to the tenour of his promise consequently upon our Faith applies them to us, or confers them upon us, it is not we sinners, that do apply them to, or confer them upon our selves.

2. Faith

2. Affirmatively, Faith is imputed to us for righteousness under the same notion, or formal consideration, as we are said to be justified by it; for as to be justified by faith, and to have faith imputed to us for righteousness are but varied expressions of the self same thing (as was aforesaid,) So I do conceive, that under what considerations of the word [Faith] we are said to be justified by faith, under the same conception must faith be understood to be imputed to us for righteousness; and this is, As it is the performance of that duty, which in the law of Faith is made the condition of our being made righteous, or our being justified for the righteousness sake of Christ. Though faith be in propriety of speech no cause of a sinners righteousness, or justification (having no natural, or meritorious, or any proper efficiency to that effect, as which is indeed *alunde*; or from other causes;) nevertheless it is by law constituted of God a Cause *sine qua non*, a thing without which it shall not be obtained; which divine constitution doth intitle it to the nature of a Condition, and as such a condition of divine appointment it is imputed to us by God for righteousness, and we are justified by it under that notion, or consideration.

Hereupon to prevent all misconstruction, I desire, it may be still remembred, That in asserting a sinners Faith [properly taken] to be imputed to him for righteousness, we do not say, That Faith is instead of perfect obedience *Quoad meritum*, as to the merit or value of it (for so we do assert Christs righteousness to be instead thereof;) All that we say (I speak for my self and other my Brethren) in effect amounts to this,

this, That whereas perfect obedience was in the Covenant of Works made the onely condition of life, it is now quite otherwise in the Covenant of Grace (God having since the fall anew modeled the government of mankind by new laws) wherein for Christs righteousnes sake Faith in him is constituted the condition of attaining righteousnes, the performance of which condition God hath promised shall be imputed to us for, or unto righteousnes, *i. e.* shall be available unto us for that righteousnes, or justification of life, which is spoken of by the Apostle, *Rom.* 5. 18, 19. And therefore I can perceive no just cause, why it may not be truly said (although I know that Doctor *Andrew Ryvet* with several other dissenting Brethren, will not allow the saying) *Quod fides habetur pro justitiâ perfectâ, quæ lege continetur, ex gratuitâ acceptatione*, *i. e.* That Faith is accounted for that perfect righteousnes, which is contained in the law, through Gods gracious acceptation: for Gods mercy, Christs merit, and the law of Faith thereupon enacted, being considered, what hinders it from being so accounted? specially it being withal considered, that according to the tenour of the new law God doth for Christs sake pardon the imperfection of our Faith and of all our sincere evangelical obedience; the imperfections whereof being covered with a gracious pardon, Why may it not be said, *Quod fides habetur pro justitiâ perfectâ* —— That Faith through Gods gracious acceptation in Christ is accounted for the righteousnes of the law, or instead of it? The true meaning of such sayings being

being no more than this, *viz.* That in point of Conditionality (not in value, or merit) Faith is inſtead thereof, and that it will thereupon ſtand a ſinner in a like ſaving ſtead, or prove as ſure a title of life unto him, as the perfect righteouſneſs of the law would have been to man continuing innocent.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXII.

Q. *Is there any perſonal righteouſneſs, which God ſees in a ſinner himſelf, upon the intuition whereof God is, or may be ſaid to be moved to juſtifie him?* Anſw. *Yes, in maintenance of the truth of which anſwer a copious reply is made to a contrariant paſſage in Doctor* Grews *Sermons upon* Jer. 23. 6.

Q. *IS there any thing, that God beholds in a ſinner, upon the ſight whereof he juſtifies him, or upon intuition of which he accounts him righteous?*

Anſw. Yea, though many, I confeſs, will ſay, No; among whom I ſhall onely inſtance in Dr *Grew*, who ſays in his forecited Sermons, *p.* 76. *God is not moved by any thing out of himſelf in our juſtification*; for proof whereof he quotes *Deu.* 7. 6. and *Mat*, 11. 26. and ſays, *So God juſtifies a ſinner by the righteouſneſs of another made his, becauſe it is his good pleaſure ſo to do: for we are juſtified when ungodly*, Rom. 4. 5. *and loved when in our blood*, Ezek. 16. 8.

Anſw. 1. There are ſeveral external requiſites to juſtification, I mean, external to God, and external to juſtification it ſelf. and alſo external, both on Chriſts part and ours: *e. g.* On Chriſts part his righteouſneſs is requiſite as the meritorious cauſe thereof, and on our part e-

vangelical righteouſneſs (ſtyled faith, the righteouſneſs of faith, obedience to the faith, obeying the Goſpel, with the like Scriptural expreſſions) is requiſite thereunto as the condition thereof.

2. The alſeeing God in the juſtification of a ſinner doth not *Ad unum*, but *Ad omnia reſpicere*, he caſts an eye of intuition upon all the requiſites thereunto, and as they are, whether themſelves by his appointment, or are made of him, he beholds and regards them, even according to their ſeveral natures and formalities: *exempli gratia*, He beholds and regards Chriſts righteouſneſs as the meritorious cauſe, and the ſinners own righteouſneſs as the condition of his being juſtified.

3. Although this Doctor affirms (as aforeſaid) that God is not moved by any thing out of himſelf in our juſtification, nevertheleſs he doth not exclude Chriſts obedience (Page 78) from being the motive of our juſtification; Whereupon I reply, that, As God in the juſtification of a ſinner may be ſaid to be moved by the righteouſneſs of Chriſt (we ſpeaking of God after the manner of men, as it is neceſſary we ſhould;) ſo he may be ſaid to be moved alſo by a ſinners own righteouſneſs, moved I mean according to the different nature of thoſe motives, *i. e.* by the one as the cauſe, and by the other (although not as any cauſe, yet) as the appointed condition of his juſtification.

4. As for the Scriptures alledged by this Author

Author to prove, that God is not moved by any thing out of himself in our justification (he means by any thing in us) they do indeed prove no such matter, the justification of sinners being not so much as spoken of in two of the said Scriptures, *Deut.* 7. 6. and *Mat.* 11. 26.

5. Although God justifies a sinner for the merits sake of the righteousnes of another, nevertheless he doth not justifie him by the righteousnes of that other made His in this Authors meaning, *i. e.* in it self or essential nature made his.

6. Although it be a Gospel-truth to say, That God doth justifie a sinner upon his faith, because it was his good pleasure to constitue this his faith the condition thereof, to promise it thereunto: nevertheless it is notoriously false to say simply, That God justifies a sinner, because it is his good pleasure so to do, and that he is not at all moved thereunto by a sinners performance of that duty, which was of his own good will and pleasure made the condition of obtaining that saving mercy. And this Doctor in saying as here he doth, hath spoken most strangely of God and for God, as if God were moved by nothing out of himself in justifying, and saving sinners: for if he doth justifie sinners meerly, because it

Although God doth justifie us freely by his grace in Christ, nevertheless it is through Faith as the means thereof, or motive thereunto (*Rom.* 3. 24,25.) else God would alike justifie all sinners, and not any one sinner more, or rather than another.

is his good pleasure to justifie them, it will, I think, follow, that he damns sinners, because it is his pleasure to damn them, whereas he says and swears the contrary, *Ezek.* 33. 11. and withal tells the righteous, saying, *Because he considereth and turneth away from all his transgressions, that he hath committed, he shall surely live, he shall not die.* The Doctors words do to my savour relish of that, which some Authors style *Turcismus*, and God forbid, that it should be owned by any of our Protestant Writers, of what denomination soever, whether *Lutheran*, or *Calvinist*.

Ezek. 18. 28.

7. Although it is said, that God justifieth the ungodly, *Rom.* 4. 5. yet it is not there said, or meant in the Doctors sense, that we are justified when ungodly; as if nothing but ungodliness, or an emptiness of all godliness were antecedently requisite to our justification: for though sin, or ungodliness be naturally necessary to render a person capable of Gospel-justification, *i. e.* of remission of sin (forasmuch as where there is no sin, there can be no place or possibility for remission:) nevertheless holy faith, or obedience to the faith is legally necessary to make a person morally capable thereof. So that (to speak the true sense of the Apostle) although God doth justifie the ungodly *Sensu diviso*, *i. e.* those, who once were ungodly, yet in *sensu composito*, *i. e.* he doth not justifie them in their ungodliness, or when ungodly, but when they become believers, or when godly and not before: Whereupon I can say no less, than that this Authors Exposition of this Scripture (oft times inculcated in his Sermons) is an ungodly exposition, it being both in it self a falsehood, and of a native tendency to ungodliness.

8. What-

8. Whatever be the importance of that love of God to his *Israel* of old there mentioned in that expreſſion (*thy time was the time of love,*) moſt undoubtedly by it cannot be meant Gods love of reconciliation, his pardoning, or juſtifying them in their blood, *i. e.* when they were, or while they were in their blood, *i. e.* in their ſin and ungodlineſs, as the Doctor would have it underſtood: for till ſinners repent and are converted, God will not juſtifie, or pardon them, or actually be reconciled to them, as appears by the current of Scripture, particularly by *Iſa.*1.16,17,18. and 55. 6,7,8.

CHAP. XXIII.

Q. *By whom is faith imputed to beliëving ſinners for, or unto righteouſneſs?* Anſ. *In anſwer hereunto that text in* Gen. 15. 6. *is vindicated from the miſconſtruction of ſome of the more ancient Rabbins, it being withal aſſerted, That it is God himſelf, who doth ſo impute it: But whether it was imputed to* Abraham *by God as Benefactor, or elſe as eſtimator, or Judge, is left to conſideration upon what is ſaid in anſwer to a Queſtion, which is the ſubject of the Chapter enſuing.*

Q. *BY whom is faith imputed to us for, or to righteouſneſs?*

Anſw. Although faith is in the New Teſtament frequently ſaid to be imputed to us for righteouſneſs; nevertheleſs I do not remember, that it is in any place expreſly there ſaid, By whom it is imputed; and therefore for the reſolution of this Queſtion we are to have recourſe to other Scriptures, and to conſult with right reaſon.

1. We may in reaſon conclude, who it is, that doth impute our faith to righteouſneſs. for foraſmuch as to be juſtified by faith, and to have our faith imputed to us for righteouſneſs are the ſelf ſame thing (as by occaſion hath been before ſaid once and again,) we may thence conclude,

that

that he, who imputes faith to a ſinner for righteouſneſs, is the ſame, who doth juſtifie him; Now ſays the Apoſtle, *It is God, that juſtifieth*, Rom. 8. 33. and 3. 30. *It is one God, which ſhall juſtifie the circumciſion by faith, and uncircumciſion through faith.* We may in reaſon hereupon unqueſtionably conclude, that it is God, who imputeth to ſinners their faith for righteouſneſs.

2. Let us for the purpoſe in hand have recourſe to the original Text, *Gen.* 15. 6. which is ſo oft quoted in the New Teſtament and rendred [*And he believed in the Lord, and he counted it unto him for righteouſneſs.*] Whence (to intimate this by the way) it is again obſervable, that the Apoſtle doth quote that text (as was uſual with our Saviour and other the ſacred Writers of the New Teſtament) out of the Septuagint, who render that paſſively, which ſtands upon the original record actively expreſſed. But they did it not without warrant: for it is obſerved by ſome expert Linguiſts, that words of the præterperfect tenſe, and active voice in the Hebrew language are of paſſive conſtruction, inſtances whereof they furniſh us with, ſuch as that in *Mic.* 1. 7. *Ezek.* 23. 47. *Eſa.* 22. 8. where the Septuagint do take the ſame liberty to vary, although from the Grammar, or Letter, yet not from the ſenſe of the Hebrew Text. But ſtill the Queſtion in hand is not as yet expreſly reſolved from that Text, and therefore it muſt ſtill be demanded, Who is that He (the Antecedent to that Relative) who muſt be underſtood to have imputed *Abrahams* believing in the Lord for righteouſneſs? *Anſw.* 1. Negatively, by He is not meant *Abraham* himſelf, as if it had been ſaid, That *Abraham* believed in the Lord, and *Abraham* did

impute it to the Lord for righteousnes, *i. e. Abraham* ascribed the promise unto the righteousnes, or goodnes of God. This is the exposition of certain Jewish Doctors, notwithstanding which there are of their own in later times, who do justly recede from it, so that there needs nothing to be said for the refutation thereof, but to assert and prove the true meaning of the words, as will next be declared in the affirmative branch of my Answer to the Question before us.

2. Affirmatively, By He is meant the Lord, and by Him *Abraham*, as if it had been said by the Historian, *Abraham* believed in the Lord and the Lord imputed it unto *Abraham* for righteousnes. This appears to be the meaning, as otherwise, so by the words following, verse 7. [*And he said unto him, I am the Lord, that brought thee out of* Ur *of the* Caldees *to give thee the land to inherit it*———] He then, that brought *Abraham* out of *Ur* of the *Caldees*, and by promise gave him the land of *Canaan* to inherit it, did impute *Abrahams* faith unto him for righteousnes. Briefly, He, who is said to impute righteousnes to believers, truly is He, who doth impute their believing in him for righteousnes; and who this He is, that imputes righteousnes unto believers, The Apostle doth explicitly acquaint us, saying (*Rom.* 4. 6. *David describeth the blessedness of the man, to whom GOD imputeth righteousnes*.

The Question in hand, you perceive, is of easie resolution, and there being no controversie about it, or depending upon it (for ought I know) there needs not much to be said concerning it.

But forasmuch as God is considerable under divers

divers capacities, or relations, *viz.* as Benefactor, and as Judge, the Queſtion may therefore be demanded, under what capacity, or conſideration did God impute *Abrahams* faith to him for righteouſneſs? *Anſw.* Although this Queſtion may ſeem too too curious and needleſs (which if indeed it were, I would not have proposed it;) nevertheleſs foraſmuch as in ſome reſpect it may be uſeful, I will therefore make ſome brief anſwer to it; but becauſe the due anſwer thereunto doth neceſſarily depend upon the reſolution of another Queſtion, which will be the ſubject of the next Chapter, I will therefore refer the deciſion of it and the Reader for ſatisfaction in that behalf to what will be there ſaid.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXIV.

Queſt. *Was not* Abraham *a Believer and his Faith thereupon actually imputed to him for Righteouſneſs before he believed the promiſe recorded in* Gen. 15. 5. *and that teſtimony given to his Faith* ver. 6? Anſw. *Yes: long before, his departure out of his native countrey* (Ur *of the* Caldees) *implying not onely a local, but alſo a moral departure.*

Queſt. *As not* Abraham *a Believer, and his Faith actually imputed to him by God for Righteouſneſs before the Viſion recorded in* Gen. 15. beg. *where in the word of the Lord both in the way of command and promiſe came to him, as are there (together with his Faith therein) diſtinctly related?*

Anſw. Yes Verily; He was juſtified certain years before, *viz.* at his departure out of his native country in obedience to the command of God, and upon his believing the promiſe of God made to him at that time (it being the ſame promiſe for ſubſtance which was occaſionally afterwards oft times renewed by God) the ſtory of all which (Gods command and promiſe and *Abrahams* faithful obedience) is recorded in the beginning of the 12*th* Chapter of this book of *Geneſis*, and to which thoſe words of the Author to the Hebrews do refer, he ſaying (Chap. 11. 8. *that by faith* Abraham, *when he was called to go into a place, which he ſhould after receive*

ceive for an inheritance obeyed, and he went out not knowing whither he went. Abraham saw full warrant from the command of God to do what he did, *i. e.* to leave his native country, onely at first though he knew the place from which, yet not knowing for some time the place, to which he was to depart, nor the way to it, till God did afterwards make them known to him. Now by this command of God to *Abraham* touching the leaving of his country, kindred and his fathers house, there is great reason (as I think) to understand, that therein is implyed, that God did not command him barrly to leave his native soil, but also the sinful fashions of that his country, *i. e.* to renounce the idols and false Gods, the worship of which his forefathers had been accustomed unto, and wherein as is most likely, himself was at first educated under his Idolatrous Ancestors, *Josh.* 24. 2. And if so, then are we by those words expressive of his obedience (He went out) to understand not simply his parting from his native country and kindred, but also the renouncing of his former sinful course of life which among them he had lived, though together with it he did renounce his neerest and deerest relations, even as every Christian for Christs sake should so far deny himself, as to do the like upon a call from God, this being to walk in the steps of that Faith of our Father *Abraham*, which he had being yet uncircumcised (*Rom.* 4.12.) and in this construction (as aforesaid) the like phrase of leaving kindred seems to be taken in *Psal.* 45. 10. *Hearken O daughter, and consider, and incline thine ears: forget also thine own people and thy fathers house.*

If

If it be said, That *Abraham* had left his Idolatry and was become a worshipper of the true God before he had that call from God to leave his country and kindred: I answer, if so, then are we rationally to conceive, That in God's commanding him to leave his country and kindred there is implyed a command to him from God to persist in his renouncing of the idolatry received from his forefathers, which for some time he had already renounced, and to continue in that Godly course of life and worship of the true God, which he had entred upon; so that still I think, That it was not onely a local, but also a moral departure (whether then to be begun, or from that time to be continued) which was by God commanded *Abraham* by the full importance of those words, [*Get thee out of thy country and from thy kindred*——] Neither do I think, that God did command *Abraham* to depart from his native soil simply as such, but as a place over-run with idolatry, an infectious place, a place of constant temptation to lewd and idolatrous living.

Briefly, I think, that God in mercy to *Abraham*, did command him to get him out of his native country and from his kindred as a snare, and a dangerous temptation, lest he should continue to be infected with that Idolatry, or return to that idolatry, which then did reign throughout *Caldea*. Yet in this conjecture (having no absolute grounds of certainty) I shall not be peremptory, freely leaving the judgment thereof to others, and the rather, because I cannot at present call to mind any Question of moment, the decision whereof doth depend

depend upon it, this onely excepted, *viz.* Whether *Abrahams* obedience to the said command of God (*Get thee out of thy country*) is, or may be alledged, as a fit instance of doing, or forbearing of a thing in its own nature purely indifferent upon the command of God? In the decision of which question I can easily suffer every one to abound in his own sense.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXV.

Queſt. *Foraſmuch as* Abraham *was a Believer, and his Faith imputed to him for Righteouſneſs long before that Teſtimony given to his Faith in* Gen. 15. 6. *How was it true to ſay, that his believing in the Lord was then, or at that time imputed to him for righteouſneſs?* Anſw. *The Queſtion is anſwered ſeveral ways. A parallel Scripture concerning* Noah (Heb. 11. 7.) *opened, by occaſion whereof* 4 *Queſtions, with reference to that clauſe* (*And he became heir of the righteouſneſs, which is by faith*) *are propoſed and anſwered,* 1. *What kind of righteouſneſs is there meant?* 2. *What is it to be an heir of that kind of righteouſneſs?* 3. *What was that righteouſneſs, which* Noah *is there ſaid to have been heir of? or, Wherein did it conſiſt?* 4. *Why is the ſaid righteouſneſs ſtyled the righteouſneſs, which is by Faith?*

Queſt. *Foraſmuch as* Abraham *was a Believer, and his Faith was thereupon imputed to him for righteouſneſs long before, how was it true to ſay as in the Text* (Gen. 15. 6.) *that his believing in the Lord, or his faith in that word of his, that came to him in a viſion afterwards, was imputed to him for righteouſneſs?*

Anſw.

Answ. The Question, or Objection may several ways be truly answered, and (as I judge) to satisfaction, *e.g.* 1. The words of the Text in *Gen.* 15. 6. may be referred to *Abrahams* first believing and to his being justified thereupon, although they are here brought in by the occasion of a relation of another act of his faith in this Chapter; and so the sense may well be, *Abraham* believed God with that Faith (the same specifical, unfeigned, operative faith) which was from the beginning, even from the command of God given to him touching his departure from his native soil and Gods promise then made unto him (which promise was now renewed) imputed to him for righteousness. There is no necessity to conceive, that this testimony should be precisely limited to, or understood onely of that particular act of his believing, whereunto it is subjoyned, but it may indifferently relate as well to the first act of his believing: for it is not said in the forecited Text, that *Abraham* believed the Lord in this particular promise now made, or renewed unto him, but indefinitly, or in the general, that *Abraham* believed, or had believed in the Lord and it was imputed to him for righteousness. This answer is the rather considerable, because it seems not to have been the intent of God in this Testimony concerning *Abraham* to shew punctually, or exactly the time when *Abraham* was first justified, but the manner how, or means by which, I say, to shew the time exactly and precisely when he first believed and was justified; for I grant, that Gods intent was to manifest the time in general *i.e.* not when *Abraham* was circumcised, but when and while he was uncircumcised.

Obj.

Obj. This construction cannot possibly stand, for it is plain by *Rom.* 4. 18. that *Abraham* believing in hope, that he should be the Father of many Nations (although against hope and all visible reasons to the contrary) was imputed to him for righteousness? *Answ.* The interpretation before rendred may well stand this Objection notwithstanding: for that promise in *Gen.* 15. was no new promise, but a promise renewed to *Abraham* and the self same in substance with that in *Gen.* 12. 2, 3. (*I will make of thee a great nation: And in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed*:) so that that Testimony concerning *Abrahams* faith as imputed to him for righteousness may as well (if not rather) relate to the act of his faith exercised upon Gods promise at first made, as well I say, as upon his promise afterwards renewed.

2. If we refer the Testimony (as aforesaid) to his first justification, or at first, we must conceive the meaning to be, That God as Benefactor did then impute his faith to him for righteousness, or did then actually justifie him.

3. Supposing Gods donation of righteousnesses to, or upon *Abraham* to have been a thing antecedent (as truly it was) to the story in *Gen.* 15. 6. We may well and truly say, That God did impute the renewed act of *Abrahams* faith unto him for righteousness as Judge, or Estimator, *i.e.* he did still account, repute, or had him in estimation as righteous, or in a state of justification.

4. Upon the said supposition of *Abrahams* faith its being long before imputed to him for righteousness, we may well and warrantably understand this Text to be meant of *Abrahams* continued

tinued believing and of Gods continued act of imputing that his continued believing for the continuance of his righteousnes, or to the continuing of him in a state of justification thereupon. And this interpretation as it is agreable to the analogy of faith, so I do judge it to be the more rational, because it is agreable to the language of Scripture, I mean to the manner of Scripture-expression of matters, concerning which that rule of the most excellent *Glassius* among many others in his *Philologia Sacra* (p. 551) is very observable, *Verbum quandoque de continuatione rei significata intelligendum est*, or, *Videtur actio aliquando nova, cum sit veteris continuatio*, i. e. *Things are sometimes in Scripture said to be, when the scope of the place, or speaker is to give us to understand their continuance*; Apt instances whereof are divers there rendred by that Learned Author, as *Jer.* 7. 3. *Amend your ways and your doings, that ye may dwel*, i. e. *continue to dwel in this place*, John 2. 11. *And his disciples believed on him*, *i. e.* persisted and were confirmed in the faith of him; for they believed on him before, as appears by the foregoing Chapter, ver. 41, 42. and *John* 14 1. *Ye believe in God, believe also in me*, *i. e.* continue to believe in me; So also Chapter 16. 30. According to the measure of this Rule, or Canon may that in *Gen.* 15. 6. very well and aptly be construed, *q. d. Abraham* persisted to believe in the Lord, and this his faith was continued to be imputed to him for righteousnes: for as of one and the same specifical faith there are divers individual acts, so there may be still one and the same substantial consequent, issue, or fruit of them all, which in sufficient propriety of speech may accordingly be ascribed both to

the one, and to the other, *i. e.* as well to after acts, as to the first act of faith. As for the answer, that is usually made by the Papists to the objection, or question in hand (they distinguishing of justification into first and second) I need not here specifie; and to avoid prolixity, I shall not at all in this place take it into consideration, and thereupon declare, what may with safety to the truth be granted, and what must be denied in the matter. I will onely specifie what is recorded concerning *Noah*, *Heb.* 11. 7. (this being an instance to my seeming parallel with what is witnessed of *Abraham*, *Gen.* 15. 6.) where it is said of him, That *by faith being warned of God of things not seen as yet, moved with fear prepared an Ark to the saving of his house, by the which he condemned the world, and became heir of the righteousness, which is by faith.* That *Noah* had faith and was righteous before God warned him to prepare the Ark, is most apparent by *Gen.* 6. 7, 8, 9. ——So that the same difficulty, or question occurs concerning him as concerning *Abraham*, *viz.* Forasmuch as *Noah* had faith and was justified before his said warning from God to prepare the Ark, how can it be said, that by any after act, or acts of faith in preparing the Ark he became heir of the righteousness, which is by faith? I will make way to the solving of this grand Question by proposing and answering three or four others.

1. What kind of righteousness is there meant?

2. What is it to be an heir of that kind of righteousness?

3. What was that righteousness, which *Noah* is there said to have been an heir of? or, wherein did it consist?

4. Why

4. Why is it ſtyled a righteouſneſs which is by Faith?

1. Q. What is there meant by righteouſneſs? *Anſw.* The word righteouſneſs is taken in a two-fold ſenſe, in a moral, or in a jural ſenſe.

1. In a moral conſtruction it implies duty commanded, this kind of righteouſneſs [actual] conſiſting in good works, in which ſenſe its taken in that Scripture, wherein *Noah* (who in all probability was a great Prince) is ſaid to have been a Preacher of righteouſneſs (2 *Pet.* 2. 5.) that is of repentance, and amendment of life.

2. It is taken in a jural, or law-ſenſe, *viz.* for that right, or title, which any one hath to have, hold, or enjoy certain benefits and bleſſings, which God hath promiſed to ſinners, and the benefits themſelves ſo promiſed and enjoyed. Inſtances of this twofold acceptation of the word righteouſneſs, have been more at large ſpecified in the ſecond Chapter of this Diſcourſe. Now the word is here to be taken not in the former, but in the latter ſenſe, as appears by the conſequence of it to the word Heir: for men are not heirs to moral righteouſneſs, becauſe ſuch righteouſneſs is not a thing tranſient, or capable of conveyance from one perſon to another, and conſequently is not inheritable; but men are heirs of jural rights to thoſe perſons who have the property, or power to diſpoſe, convey, or grant ſuch rights to others. In this ſenſe the word righteouſneſs is oft times taken in Scripture, ſpecially in the Epiſtles of S. *Paul*, *viz.* for a right of liberty, or exemption from ſuch puniſh-

niſhments, or grievous things, which others are liable unto, and in this ſenſe the word is to be taken in the Text before us, *Heb.*11.7.

2. Q. What is it to be an heir of the ſaid righteouſneſs? *Anſw.* To be an Heir of this righteouſneſs is to have, or poſſeſs a right, or title thereunto: for heir being a jural word, or Law term, ſignifies one, who hath a right or title to this, or that priviledge, benefit, eſtate, or the like.

3. Q. What was that righteouſneſs, which *Noah* is there ſaid to have been an heir of, or to have been intitled unto? Wherein did it conſiſt? *Anſw.* This is a different queſtion from the firſt in order, that was propoſed, and therefore muſt receive a different anſwer: for that queſtion did onely enquire concerning the kind of this righteouſneſs, of what ſort it was, and accordingly it was reſolved, that it was not of that kind, which we commonly ſtyle Moral, but Jural. But this queſtion doth enquire concerning the matter of this Jural righteouſneſs, what it was, or wherein it did conſiſt? to which I anſwer, it did import ſomething literally, and ſomething myſtically,

1. This righteouſneſs in the literal ſenſe did conſiſt in that right, which God by promiſe granted to him and his houſe, to be ſaved from the † flood, to which the impenitent world was actually condemned; and from which right theſe were (as I may ſo ſay, meaning the word in a negative, not in a privative ſenſe) diſ-inherited.

† In this ſenſe the word [righteouſneſs] is ſometimes taken in Scripture, *viz.* for outward proſperity, temporal deliverances and preſervations, *Haſ.*1c.12. *Iſa.* 48. 18. although not as excluding Gods ſaving love and favour.

2. In

2. In the myſtical ſenſe it did conſiſt in *Noahs* deliverance from the deluge of Gods eternal wrath: for the ſaving of *Noah* by the Ark from the flood was a kind of type, or ſhadow of eternal ſalvation by Chriſt. Deſtruction by the flood was but part of that puniſhment, which the impenitent world did ſuffer, and deliverance from that flood was but a part of the great reward, eternal ſalvation being that, which is obtained by faith in Chriſt. All this ſeems to be ſignified by that Doctrine of St. *Peter* 1. 3. 21, 22. where there is mention of ſalvation, together with the cauſes or means of it, as the water of baptiſm, the anſwer of a good conſcience towards God (which in effect is true faith and repentance) as alſo the reſurrection of Chriſt.

4. Q. Why is the ſaid righteouſneſs ſtyled the righteouſneſs which is by faith?

Anſw. Becauſe the right, which he had to be ſaved, as aforeſaid, did proceed from Gods ſpecial grace and free promiſe, conditionally upon his faith: for as faith and works are oppoſed, ſo is a right by faith oppoſed to that right, which accrues by ſtrict deſert, merit of works, or valuable ſervice. The Author therefore by that expreſſion would intimate to us, that *Noah* had no right to the ſaid benefits by the merit of his works, but all the right he had came from Gods gracious grant in a free promiſe, which *Noah* accepting with an operative faith, whereby at Gods command he prepared the Ark, the ſaid right was actually inveſted in him, or ſettled upon him.

These things being thus premised, to the said question (How can it be said, that *Noah*, being a believer and justified before Gods warning him to prepare the Ark, by an after act, or acts of Faith in preparing the Ark did become or was made heir of the righteousnes, which is by faith?) I do now make answer, That *Noah* being justified before may upon the after acts of his faith be said to be made heir of the righteousnes, which is by faith, because as upon these after acts or actings of his faith he had a right conferred upon him to temporal salvation from the deluge, so thereupon he had also his former right to eternal salvation from the wrath of God continued to him: *Noahs* preparing of the Ark was one special act of that faith, which was from former days habitual in his soul, which if he had not at that time and therein exercised, he had incurred the danger not onely of a temporal deluge, but the deluge also of Gods eternal wrath: so that by this after acting of his faith he escaped the danger of both, and thereupon as he came to Have a right to a temporal salvation, so to Hold his right to eternal salvation, so that as upon it he became an heir of temporal happines in this world, so he continued to be an heir of eternal happines in the world to come.

And this was a fit argument to perswade to perseverance in faith (this being the scope of the Apostle both in this and in the latter end of the Chapter foregoing) perseverance wherein after the example of *Noah* and the rest named in this Chapter, of whom it is testified, that they all died in faith, perseverance, I say, wherein was the onely way to escape the deluge of Gods eternal wrath, and perdition, which the Apostle

in

in the laſt verſe of the foregoing Chapter tells them would prove the fate of all ſuch as did draw back, and did not continue in faith, in which ſenſe the word (believe) is taken in that verſe, *viz.* for continuance in the faith, it being oppoſed to a drawing back (*We are not of them that draw back to perdition* (ſays the Apoſtle) *but of them who do believe, i. e.* who without drawing back do perſiſt to believe, to the ſalvation of the ſoul.

CHAP. XXVI.

Q. *What was the object of that faith of* Abrahams, *which is ſaid to have been imputed to him for righteouſneſs?* Anſw. *Generally thoſe revelations, which God had imparted to him concerning his divine will,* i. e. *both* Mandati *and* beneplaciti: *both what God himſelf had promiſed to do, and alſo what he had commanded* Abraham *to do, the prime whereof (both the things commanded and promiſed) are made inſtances in; Hereupon ſix things as obſervable are commended to conſideration, with a reflection upon a paſſage in that very learned forein Writer, Doctor* And. Ryvet.

Queſt. WHat *was the object of* Abrahams *faith, that was imputed to him for, or to righteouſneſs?*

Anſw. Without controverſie it was *Divinum teſtimonium*, certain the Oracles of God, ſome ſupernatural revelation, or revelations, that were made known unto him by God, which what they were, will be the ſubject of the preſent enquiry, wherein I ſhall not think it neceſſary to ſearch, whether that προ-ευαγγέλιον, that divine revelation touching the promiſed ſeed (*Gen.* 3, 15.) came

came to his knowledge [antecedently to his extraordinary call out of *Ur* of the *Caldees*] by tradition, as it did to the Patriarchs before the flood: for whether this can be demonstrably proved, or no, it is fully sufficient to my purpose in hand to manifest, what those supernatural revelations were, which being personally made known to *Abraham*, were the objects of that faith of his, which was imputed to him for righteousness. The matter of these revelations may upon the main (as I conceive) be reduced to these two heads (divine Commands and divine Promises) as will instantly be made manifest by three special Revelations from God unto him, that are recorded in three several Chapters in the Book of *Genesis*, *viz.* Chap. 12. begin. Where God is said to have commanded him to leave his contrey (by which in probability was meant not onely a local, but a moral departure, as was aforesaid Chapter 24.) and to have promised to make him a great nation, and to bless him, to make him an exemplar of blessing, and that in him, *i.e.* in his seed all the families of the earth should be blessed; herein God having revealed to him more particularly that, which was onely indefinitly revealed to the former ages: for whereas God had onely made known to them, that in the seed of the woman the world should be blessed, he acquaints *Abraham*, that it should be in his seed. Now in *Gen.* 15. begin. God doth partly renew the same promise to him, giving him also a command to persevere (for this I am perswaded, is comprized in that inhibition, Fear not) animating him thereunto with these words (*I am thy shield and exceeding great reward,*) and partly he makes certain new revelations to him, which

which are recorded, ver. 13, 14, 15, 16. and may be read at leisure. In *Gen.* 22. begin. there is recorded another revelation (besides the renewing of the former promise and the institution of circumcision as a seal thereof, chap. 17. and again the renewing thereof, chap. 18.) where God imposeth a new command upon him for the offering up his son to him as a sacrifice, upon his faithful performance whereof (for so it is interpreted *Heb.* 11. 17.) God doth again renew his former promises, both general and special, yea with the addition of an oath for *Abrahams* more abundant confirmation, and consolation ver. 16, 17, 18.

Now be it considered, that although these words (*Abraham believed in the Lord, and he imputed it to him for righteousness*) are recorded onely by occasion of the second revelation in *Gen.* 15. nevertheless all the said revelations were the objects of *Abrahams* justifying faith, and by the same reason as it is said respectively to the second, it may be truly said, That respectively to them all, *Abraham* believed in the Lord, and he imputed it to him for righteousness. And there is the more reason thus to conclude, because that testimony of Scripture recorded as immediately referring to the second divine Revelation made to *Abraham*, St *James* doth apply to the third, saying, That upon *Abrahams* offering *Isaac* his son upon the altar the Scripture was fulfilled, which saith, *Abraham believed God, and it was imputed to him for righteousness*, Chap. 2. 21. 22, 23.

The premisses considered, I humbly desire, that the following remarks may be duely observed, and minded.

1. That

1. That the object of *Abrahams* justifying faith was not only divine promises, but also divine commands, *Get thee out of thy countrey chap.* 12. 1. *Fear not*, i. e. *be constant, fear not them, that can kill the body and after that have no more, that they can do.* Gen. 15. 1. *Walk before me, and be upright*, chap. 17. 1. *Take thy son, thy onely son* Isaac, *whom thou loveſt, and get thee into the land of* Moriah, *and offer him there for a burnt offering* —— *Gen.* 22. beg. All theſe are expreſs commands.

2. Obſerve, That *Abraham* did not onely believe the promiſes, but alſo perform the commands of God, one command of God, as well as another, ſeemingly never ſo harſh and contrary to fleſh and blood, yea although the performance of Gods command in the ſacrificing of his ſon did ſeem utterly to make againſt the accompliſhing of his promiſe.

Briefly, *Abraham* did not onely believe, that God is, and is a rewarder of them that diligently ſeek him, but by vertue of that his faith, himſelf was according to the divine command a diligent ſeeker of God. He did all Gods commands without murmurings, and diſputings.

3. Be it obſerved, that the things promiſed to *Abraham* were not onely things temporal, *viz.* a legitimate iſſue (a ſeed of God, or a Godly ſeed as is the Prophets expreſſion, *Mal.* 2. 15.) and this by his old wife, and the Land of *Canaan* to be his in preſent right & to be his poſterities in future poſſeſſion, but things of ſpiritual and eternal concernment, *viz.* pardon of ſin and everlaſting ſalvation by Chriſt. This is it, which is implyed in that pro ſe of God expreſſed in thoſe words to *Abraham* (*I am thy ſhield and exceeding*

ceeding great reward, or as the *Septuagint* render them, as well they may, *I am thy ſhield, and thy reward ſhall be exceeding great*,) wherein is compriſed (ſay the *Dutch* Annotations upon the place) *Omnis beatitudo, quæ hic incipit, & in futurâ vitâ completur*, All that felicity, which is begun in this life, and perfected in that which is to come. And though it be ſaid, that *Socinus* did confine the promiſe of God to *Abraham* unto matters of temporal concernment, yet *Crellius*, I am ſure, doth not ſo: for in his comment on *Hebrews* 11. 10. He yields, *That* Abraham *hoped to have from God ſome life and happineſs after his death, in regard he knew the great goodneſs of God toward his Servitors, and the great power of God, that he is able to raiſe even the dead, and can give his ſervants a bleſſing, or reward after their death*; and he ſays expreſly, *That the promiſes of God made to* Abraham *and his ſeed do in the myſtical ſenſe contain this ſpiritual and heavenly inheritance. And in the ſame ſenſe the ſeed of* Abraham *doth ſignifie the ſeed of all the faithful, who follow the faith of* Abraham: *for both theſe ſenſes are taught us by the Apoſtle, Rom.* 4, 11, 12, 13. and *Gal.* 3. 7. and 4. 22.

Thus that *Socinian* Author. He doth indeed peremptorily deny, that *Abraham* underſtood more than a temporal felicity to be comprized in thoſe bare words of Gods promiſe to be his exceeding great reward, or that his reward ſhould be exceeding great; and *Ryvet* alſo upon the place ſeems to be of the ſame opinion with him therein, and upon the ſame ground, *viz.* becauſe of *Abrahams* reply to God in the words following (*Lord God, what wilt thou give me, ſeeing I go childleſs, and* ——) which he would not have made, ſay they, if he had apprehended heaven-

heavenly happineſs to be intimated in the words aforeſaid. But for my own part, I do not perceive any cogency in the ſaid reaſon alledged for their purpoſe: for as for the words of *Abrahams* reply, though they have in ſhort the form of a Queſtion, or Expoſtulation, nevertheleſs they ſeem to me to have the force of an holy complaint, and fervent ſupplication (I may warrantably call the complaint Holy, notwithſtanding ſome mixture of humane infirmity therein perhaps not to be denied) which may not unfitly be thus more at large paraphraſed,

Lord God, I do well underſtand that temporal felicity, which thou doſt promiſe me in being my exceeding great reward, but to what great purpoſe is this, ſeeing I am like to depart the world childleſs? I am rich enough already in cattel, in ſilver and in gold (Gen. 13. 2.) *and how inſignificant a thing would it be for thee to give me more, ſo long as I have no child of my own body to inherit it after me, the ſteward of my houſe this* Eliezer *of* Damaſcus *being in expectation to inherit my eſtate, when I (now a man ſo old) am gone? Lord God, I do well underſtand alſo that heavenly felicity intimated to me in thy promiſe of being my exceeding great reward, but how can this be effected and brought about, ſo long as I do not experience thy promiſe to be fulfilled in giving me a child, from whoſe loyns the Meſſias is to iſſue, in whom my ſelf and all the families of the earth ſhall be eternally bleſſed? Except thou haſten the performance of thy promiſe in giving me a child (I being already ſo ſtricken in years) how ſhall the ſaid promiſed bleſſedneſs to me and them ever come to paſs? Thou, who art* Jehovah Adonai, *haſten O Lord God the performance of thy gracious word and free promiſe.*

Briefly,

Briefly, as the bleſſed Virgin having heard that meſſage from God by the mouth of the Arch-angel concerning her bringing forth a ſon (the Meſſias) replyed, ſaying, How ſhall this be, ſeeing I know not a man? to the like ſenſe and purpoſe may *Abrahams* reply to God be interpreted, without any imputation to *Abrahams* not apprehending of any more than temporal felicity to have been promiſed to him in thoſe words, *I am thy ſhield and exceeding great reward.* And as upon that reply in the way of queſtion by the bleſſed Virgin, the Arch-angel did immediately ſatisfie her ſaying (*The Holy Ghoſt ſhall come upon thee, and the power of the Higheſt ſhall ever ſhadow thee...*) Even ſo upon that reply of *Abraham* to God queſtion-wiſe, doth God (who being the ſearcher of hearts, did know the mind of the Spirit in thoſe words of *Abraham*, *Lord God, what wilt thou give me?*) inſtantly ſatisfie that his aged ſervant, ſaying, *This ſhall not be thine heir* ———

But whatever be the due conſtruction of thoſe words (*I am thy exceeding great reward*) or whatever the preſent conſtruction that *Abraham* did make of them was, it is a thing not to be queſtioned, but that the things promiſed by God to *Abraham* were not onely of temporal, but alſo of eternal concernment: for

1. By *Abrahams* ſeed in thoſe words (*In thy ſeed ſhall all the kindreds of the earth be bleſſed*) St. *Peter* doth interpret to be meant Jeſus Chriſt, as appears by *Act.* 3. 25. compared with ver. 26. and ſo alſo doth St. *Paul* (as that Text is uſually expounded, *Gal.* 3. 16.) *He ſaith not to ſeeds as of many, but as of one: And to thy ſeed, which is Chriſt.* Thence it is, that Jeſus Chriſt (the true *Iſaac*) is juſtly as uſually ſtyled by us (ἀντιτυπικῶς) the promiſed

ſeed.

ſeed. *Abraham* had in the ſaid promiſe a proſpect of Chriſt, whereupon Chriſt ſays, *Abraham ſaw my day and rejoyced* Joh. 8. 56.

2. God is ſaid by the Apoſtle in that promiſe to have preached the Goſpel to *Abraham*, *Gal.* 3.8. which Goſpel is of ſoul-concernment (for were it onely of temporal concernment, it were not worthy in a ſignal ſenſe to be ſo called) and thence it is ſtyled the Goſpel of ſalvation, *Eph.* 1.13. and the word of ſalvation, *Act.* 13.26. and The grace of God which bringeth ſalvation, *Tit.* 2.11.

3. That Goſpel, or good news, which was in the ſaid promiſe preached to *Abraham*, was remiſſion of ſin, or juſtification through faith in Chriſt to be enjoyed by all the kindreds of the earth, as the Apoſtle doth plainly interpret the matter, ſaying, (*Gal.* 3. 8, 9.) *And the Scripture foreſeeing, that God would juſtifie the Heathen through faith, preached before the Goſpel unto* Abraham, *ſaying, In thee ſhall all nations be bleſſed (that is, By Faith in thee, as the Apoſtle expounds it in the words immediately following.) ſo then, they which be of faith, are bleſſed with faithful* Abraham. And this is that bleſſedneſs, which *Abraham* is ſaid to have expected, or which (as *Crellius* conſtrues it) expected *Abraham*, and which the Apoſtle ſets forth in that Metaphorical expreſſion, *Heb.* 11.10. *He looked for a City, which hath foundations, whoſe builder and maker is God.*

4. Obſerve, That although juſtification, remiſſion of ſin and everlaſting ſalvation through faith in Chriſt, or his righteouſneſs were the main part of the bleſſedneſs therein promiſed, nevertheleſs the imputation of Chriſts righteouſneſs appears not at all promiſed unto, or expected

pected by either him or his; and therefore was no object of the faith of *Abraham*, or any of his posterity. And for my own part I am perswaded, that the groundless asserting of such an imputation hath been one great occasion of hardening *Socinus* with his partakers against the Protestant Churches (not to mention also our adversaries of the *Romish* Church;) nor do I perceive any more reason, why any Protestant Preacher, or Writer should be had in suspicion as less friends to Christ, for their denying the imputation of Christs righteousness in the sense here opposed, because his enemies the *Socinians* do deny it, than for their maintaining Jesus Christ to be the Son, or Holy One of God, because the Devil himself did make that confession of him.

5. Be it observed, that the promise of justification, remission of sin, and everlasting blessedness through *Abrahams* seed (the true Messias) to all the Nations of the Earth, was no more absolute to them, than it was to *Abraham* himself. The truth is, that blessedness was not absolutely promised to either, but conditionally to both: to *Abraham* upon his operative faith, and to all other sinners upon condition of the same specifical faith, such as *Abrahams* was.

And thus doth St. *Paul* himself interpret that promise (*In thee shall all the nations of the earth be blessed*;) I mean, he doth interpret it to have the foresaid condition implyed therein, and therefore constructively to be a conditional promise: for which see *Gal.* 3. Where having mentioned that promise, vers. 8. he adds, saying, ver. 9. So then, they, which be of faith, are blessed (he says not simply with *Abraham*, but) with FAITHFUL *Abraham*,

Abraham, intimating thereby, That faith (an operative faith, such a faith, as *Abrahams* was) is the condition of the promised blessedness in and through the promised seed unto all the nations of the earth. This is the faith, which doth speak a person to be like to *Abraham*, or doth denominate us *Abrahams* children, as is the Apostles language, saying ver. 7. *Know ye therefore* (a considerable thing indeed, and therefore to be well known, although to this day many seem to take no due knowledge of it) *that they which are of faith* (that is of a faith like that of *Abraham*) *the same are the children of* Abraham. The inheriting of our father *Abrahams* blessing (as is the Apostles expression, ver. 14. depends upon our inheriting his faith, I mean, our imitating his faith, as the condition thereof.

6. Be it observed, that the object of *Abrahams* faith was not this, or the like revelation, or proposition, Thou *Abraham* art a person in Christ, Art actually justified, Reconciled to God, Art in his special love and favour——— I say, no such proposition, or revelation was the object of his faith, except upon supposition of his faith antecedently thereunto. I put in this exception for the preventing of an objection easie to be foreseen: for may some object, saying, Doth not God in those very words (*I am thy shield and thy exceeding great reward*) assert *Abraham* to be a person justified, Reconciled, blessed with his special love and favour? and was not *Abraham* (*fide divinâ*) to believe this report, it being uttered by the mouth of God himself?

Answ. The words in the original are defective, the Verb being wanting, and being word for word rendred, are [*I thy shield and thy exceed-*

ing great reward] and they may be ſupplied indifferently with a verb ſubſtantive, whether of the preſent tenſe (I am) or of the future (I will be.)

2. If we ſupply them with a verb of the preſent tenſe, as we find them ſupplied by our *Engliſh* Tranſlators, then the words muſt be underſtood upon ſuppoſition of *Abrahams* faith as antecedent, or of *Abraham* his being a true believer before this revelation, or affirmation; which we may well ſuppoſe, foraſmuch as he was truly a believer before this viſion, or revelation recorded in this Chapter, as hath been already proved from *Gen.* 12. beg.

3. If we ſupply the words with a verb of the future tenſe, as do the Septuagint (thy reward ſhall be exceeding great) or I will be thy exceeding great reward, then are they to be conceived of under the notion of a promiſe from God to *Abraham*, wherein God doth promiſe to him the continuance of his fatherly protection, favour and benediction, he continuing not to fear, or fall back, but ſtill to walk before him and to be faithful unto death. I grant indeed, that God may be ſaid to be the reward of the faithful both in an active and in a paſſive ſenſe, *i. e.* he will reward them, and he will be their reward, (he will be their rewarder, and their reward) and it may indifferently be rendred in either ſenſe. Yet I am apt to think, that the words are conſtructively a promiſe, rather than an aſſertion, or affirmation, and that they are to be ſupplied rather with a verb of the future tenſe (I will be) than of the preſent (I am.) My reaſon is, not ſimply, becauſe the Septuagint (as was aforeſaid) do ſo render them (*thy reward ſhall be exceeding great*;) but becauſe *Abraham* himſelf did underſtand them

them under the notion of a promiſe, as appears by his reply thereunto, ſaying, *Lord God, what wilt thou give me*-- Hereby it is manifeſt, that the ſaid words of God did bode ſomewhat, that was coming towards him, and which God did therein promiſe at one time or other to beſtow upon him, acccording to *Abrahams* conſtruction thereof.

Having thus cleared this ſixth particular commended to obſervation, I ſhall now recommend it; and much the rather do I deſire it to be taken into impartial conſideration, becauſe there are ſome, who would have this, or the like propoſition (Thou art a perſon reconciled to God, Art one in his ſpecial love, and fatherly favour-) to be the object of juſtifying faith, a faith like that of *Abrahams*; and this is it, which ſome Proteſtant Writers do ſeem to maintain to have been the object of *Abrahams* faith, and to maintain it both againſt Papiſts, Socinians and Arminians, I ſhall inſtance only in one, the forecited eminent Author (Dr *And. Ryvet* in one of his exercitations upon *Geneſis*, p. 403.) and having recited his words with my reply thereunto, I ſhal freely and friendly leave the judgment thereof to every intelligent, and unprejudicate Reader.

The ſaid Author having ſaid, that *Abraham* in the promiſe did embrace God as a father, he adds immediately, ſaying, *Quâ ratione nos juſtificat fides, noſque deo reconciliat, non ſuo quidem merito, ſed dum gratiam nobis in promiſſionibus divinis oblatam recipientes, certo perſuaſi ſumus, nos amari à deo tanquam filios*, i.e. *After the ſame faſhion* (or *manner*) *faith juſtifies us, and reconciles us to God, truly not by its own merit, but while we receiving* (or *embracing*) *the grace offered to us in the divine promiſes, are aſſuredly, or certainly, perſwaded that we are beloved of God as children.*

The truth is, and we all confeſs it, that faith doth not juſtifie us by its own merit, nor do Arminians or Socinians (for ought I know, or ever heard) ſay otherwiſe, but faith doth juſtifie us, as it is the performed condition of the new covenant, or law of faith, which performance materially is ſuch an embracing of the grace and favour of God promiſed and offered therein, as doth effectually encline us ſincerely to do the duty, which in the ſaid law or covenant is required in order to the enjoyment thereof; But it is not true to ſay with this learned, but herein miſtaken Author (with too many other Brethren, ſpecially of forein Churches) that faith is ſuch an embracing, or receiving of the grace of God offered in his promiſes, as that we are aſſuredly, or certainly perſwaded, that we are beloved of God as children, and that this is the faith, that doth juſtifie us and reconcile us to God, even as it did *Abraham* in the ſame manner. Is it not ſtrange that learned men ſhould not even of themſelves diſcern the inconſiſtency of ſuch ſayings with the truth of Scripture, and right reaſon, yea how inconſiſtent they are with themſelves? for how can that be ſaid to reconcile a perſon to God, which doth aſſuredly perſwade him, that he is already, or was antecedently to his believing reconciled to God and beloved of him? Is not this plainly to make a ſinner reconciled to God before he be reconciled, making the perſwaſion of his reconciliation to God the means of his reconciliation? The ſcandal, that in ſuch aſſertions as theſe by ſome Proteſtant Writers in extremes hath been given to the common Adverſary, is much to be lamented.

I ſhall caution the Reader againſt another of his

his miſtakes in the ſame Lecture, *p* 406 *Non gaudet aliquis* (ſays he) *ob juſtificationem, cujus ſe participem eſſe non ſentit*, i. e. *No man rejoyceth for that juſtification, whereof he perceives not himſelf to be a partaker.* This ſaying is far from truth: for a man may and ought to rejoyce in a probability, yea a poſſibility of having that, which at preſent he hath not. And Gods conditional promiſes of juſtifying the ungodly, are juſt matter of joy to all ſinners, and wherein they ought greatly to rejoyce, although at preſent they are not juſtified, they being yet in the gall of bitterneſs and in the bond of iniquity, or in their ungodlineſs.

Having declared more at large in this Chapter what was the object of *Abrahams* faith, that was imputed to him for righteouſneſs, I will in the next Chap. propoſe it to enquiry, what was the object of the faith of the Patriarchs before the flood, that was imputed to them for righteouſneſs.

CHAP. XXVII.

Q. *What was the object of the faith of* Abel, Enoch, Noah, *and other the faithfull Patriarchs of the old world before* Abraham *was*? Anſw. *Such things as were made known to them by ſupernatural revelation, which things are ſummarily ſaid to be Gods Exiſtence and his Beneficence, proved by* Heb. 11.6. *Hereupon two Queſtions are propoſed and anſwered,* 1. *Whether Gods Exiſtence and Beneficence were not things of natural revelation, or made known by the light of nature*? 2. Q. *Whether was it made known to the ſaid Patriarchs before the flood, that God* [*in Chriſt, or for Chriſts ſake*] *was, or would be the Rewarder of them who diligently ſeek him*?

Q. *What was the object of the faith of* Abel, Enoch, Noah, *and other the Patriarchs before the flood, that was imputed to them for righteouſneſs*?

Anſw. This Queſtion doth ſuppoſe, that thoſe Ancient Fathers had faith, and that their faith was imputed to them for righteouſneſs; and this may ſecurely be preſumed to the enquiry in hand: for the Author to the *Hebrews*, (chap. 11. beg.)

beg.) doth teſtifie of ſeveral of them by name, that they had faith, and that thereupon they became heirs of the righteouſneſs, which is by faith, *i.e.* of right, or title to life eternal: for this being expreſly teſtified concerning one of them (*Noah* by name verſe 7.) by the ſame reaſon we may ſafely conclude it to be verified concerning the reſt, and ſo much (for ought I know) is imported in that witneſs, which *Abel* is ſaid upon his faith to have obtained, *viz.* That he was righteous; for upon believing to be made righteous, and thereupon to be made, or to become an heir of the righteouſneſs, which is by faith, I take to be phraſes ſynonymous, and of the ſelf-ſame importance. Conſequently hereupon with like ſecurity of truth I may preſume, that they were under a covenant of grace made to them, and indeed to all men in *Adam*; and that this covenant was in force to all mankind, before it was renewed to *Abraham* with the addition of certain great priviledges peculiar to him and his natural poſterity above the reſt of the world upon his extraordinary and moſt exemplary faith; I ſay, the covenant of grace was in force to all mankind, before it was renewed to *Abraham*; for it is moſt evident, that *Cain* himſelf [one of the Serpents ſeed] was not excepted, God ſaying to him, *If thou do well, ſhalt not thou be accepted?* If *Cain*, as *Abel*, had done well, he as well as his younger brother, had obtained witneſs, that he was righteous. Theſe things being preſuppoſed as things undubitable, I anſwer to the Queſtion, 1. More generally, Some divine, or ſupernatural revelation was the object of their faith. This doth neceſſarily follow from the premiſſes, That if thoſe Patriarchs had faith, then ſome ſuperna-

tural revelation was the object of it: for this is the difference betwixt faith and knowledge, or betwixt that kind of assent, which is called *Assensus fidei*, and *Assensus scientificus*, the assent of faith and knowledge, that being a supernatural assent, or an assent to some truth made known by divine witness, or supernatural revelation, but this being a natural assent to such truths as are made known, or revealed to us by the light of nature. Onely it concerns us rightly to understand the reason of the said expressions, why the said object of faith is said to be certain truths testified by supernatural revelation, the reason whereof is not, because it is always so *ex parte rei*, *i.e.* because we cannot be said to believe any truth made known unto us by natural demonstration, but the said assent is called supernatural *ex parte medii*, because the ground, reason, or motive thereof is evermore divine testimony, the witness of God, or supernatural revelation; so that although faith and knowledge may, and do frequently agree *ex parte rei cognita*, *i.e.* Although they may and often have the same material object, or objective matter, to which we do yield our assent, nevertheless they do always differ *ex parte modi*, *cen medii*, *i, e.* in the ground or motive of that assent, natural demonstration being the ground of the one, and supernatural revelation or divine witness being always the ground of the other.

2. I answer more particularly, The Existence and Beneficence of God were the objects of the faith of those Patriarchs; as is most evident by what the Author to the *Hebrews* asserts in the sixth verse of that Chapter, saying (*For without faith it is impossible to please God: for he that cometh*

to God, muſt believe, that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them, that diligently ſeek him.) In thoſe words are conſiderable the ſubject and the object of ſaving faith,

1. The Subject of this faith is one, that comes to God, every one who comes to God. Now to come to God is for ſinful man to turn to him, to ſeek and ſerve, and pleaſe God. This coming (as the Apoſtle there gives us to underſtand) always preſuppoſeth faith, and follows it as an effect upon its cauſe, faith being the principle, or maſter-wheel of this divine motion, ſtyled Coming to God.

2. Obſerve there the object, or objects of ſaving faith, *viz.* 1. The Exiſtence of God. God is. As God himſelf is *Prima veritas incomplexa*, the firſt ſimple truth, ſo (God is) *prima veritas complexa*, the firſt categorical, or affirmative propoſition. As Gods being, or Exiſtence is firſt and before all other things and Exiſtences, ſo that God is, or doth exiſt, muſt needs be the firſt truth, and firſt to be believed in order to our coming to him: for if a man believes not, that God is, or that there is a God, he can never come to him.

2. The other object of their faith is ſaid to be Gods Munificence, in his being a Rewarder of them, that do diligently ſeek him, or ſeek him out (as the word ſignifies) that is, who do ſeek him in good earneſt, ſeriouſly, throughly and conſtantly. This rewarding of them who are diligent ſeekers of God, doth comprize his accepting their perſons, his pardoning their ſins, and finally his beſtowing upon them life everlaſting. Now as the belief of a God is the firſt ground of all religious ſervice, and firſt therefore

fore to be believed, so the belief of Gods being a Rewarder of piety, is a second, and therefore in the second place is to be believed; for if sinners believe, that there is a God, and yet are not perswaded, that he will reward them, who diligently seek him, they will have little, or no heart to his service, their religion will be very cold, or rather none at all. Thence that of the Psalmist (130.4.) *There is forgiveness with thee, that thou mayst be feared.* We use to say, that the end is the principle of motion in morals. It is the belief of the final reward of blessedness, which is a prime principle of this moral motion, *i.e.* of diligent seeking of God. As our Saviour says concerning those two great commandments of the law (the love of God and our Neighbour *Mat.*22.34,40.) they are like one another, and on them two do hang all the law and the Prophets, in like sort may it truly be said concerning those two objects of faith (Gods Existence and Beneficence) they are of a like necessity to be believed in order to salvation, and upon the belief of them hangs all the worship and service of the true, and living God. It being apparent by the premisses, that the Existence and Beneficence of God were the objects of the Patriarchs faith, witnessed, or made known unto them by supernatural revelation. I shall think it expedient thereupon to propose two useful Questions,

1. Whether Gods existence and beneficence were not known to them by natural demonstrations, or were not revealed to them by the light of nature? to which I answer affirmatively, I doubt not, but that they were some way made known to them, and indeed so they were also some way made known to the Heathen world:

for

for the Heathen by the light of nature knew, That God is, whom their Philoſophers ſtyled πρῶτον τὸ ὄν, the firſt being, and τὸ αἴτιον πάσιν, καὶ ἀρχήν τινα, a certain cauſe and beginning of all things. And the Apoſtle puts the matter out of doubt, affirming of the Heathen and of the book of nature, *That that which may be known of God, was manifeſt to them, God having ſhewed it unto them; for the inviſible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly ſeen, being underſtood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead, ſo that they are without excuſe*, and verſe 20. he ſays, *that they knew God although they did not glorifie him as God.* That the Heathen did not onely know God, but moreover that they in ſome ſort knew him to be a Remunerator of them, that diligently ſeek him, and that they knew this ſo far forth at leaſt as to leave them ἀναπολογήτους, without excuſe, ſeems to be evident, from that Scripture; nor can I perceive, how any ſinner ſhould be left of God altogether without excuſe, if God had not, by one means or other, revealed unto him both his Exiſtence and Beneficence, both that he is and is a rewarder of them, who diligently ſeek him. It is true indeed, that God (in Chriſt, or for Chriſts ſake) will reward them, who diligently ſeek him, is not a thing diſcoverable by the light of nature, nor can it be known without ſupernatural revelation, and whether God did thus far forth make it known to the Patriarchs, is a Queſtion, which before the cloſe of this Chapter I will propoſe and make anſwer to. In the mean while let it be obſerved, that theſe two Articles (That God is and that he is a rewarder of them, that diligently ſeek him) were Articles, or objects both of the knowledge

and

and faith of the Patriarchs, they were things to which they did yield a twofold kind of assent, that which in the Schools is called *Assensus scientificus*, or *Scientiæ*, and *Assensus fidei*, God having made these things known unto them both by natural and supernatural revelation. Briefly, These were Articles, both known and believed; yet as for the first Article touching the Existence of God, it is true to say, It is in order of nature first to be known, and afterwards to be believed. That faith and knowledge may have one and the same material object hath been already said and manifested, though the assent of the one and the other being of different kinds their formal objects do always differ; by their formal objects I mean, the formal motive, medium, or ground, upon which our assent is founded, the one being founded upon natural demonstration and the other upon supernatural revelation or divine testimony.

Q. *Was it made known to the Patriarchs before the flood, by supernatural revelation, that God in Christ, or for Christs sake is a rewarder of them, who diligently seek him, and consequently was this any object of their faith?*

Answ. I think it was: for I am perswaded, that as it is said of *Abraham*, That the Gospel was preached to him, *Gal.* 3. 8. so also, that it was preached to them; and that as it was preached to him in that saying mentioned there by S. *Paul* (*In thee shall all nations be blessed*) so it was preached to them in that saying recorded concerning the seed of the woman its bruising the Serpents head; as the Gospel was preached to *Abraham* under the notion of His seed [*signanter*,] so I am perswaded, that it was preached to those Patriarchs

archs under the notion of *Semen mulieris*, the ſeed of a woman [indefinitly.] And the grounds of this my perſwaſion are theſe two, 1. Becauſe, as this is the moſt received opinion of almoſt all Proteſtant, that I may not ſay alſo, almoſt all Chriſtian Writers (for ought I know and from whom I would not willingly recede without evident and cogent reaſon) ſo I never hitherto have perceived the cogency of what hath been objected to the contrary. I will not here relate what is objected againſt the ſaid interpretation by the *Socinian*, or any other Writers, all of them being (to reaſonable ſatisfaction as I think) anſwered by ſeveral Authors, one of the laſt whereof, that I have read ſome years ago, is that Elegant Latiniſt and very learned man Dr. *Arrowſmith*, (*Tactica Sacra*, *p.* 4,5.) to whom among many others I ſhall refer the Reader, who ſcruples the matter here in Queſtion.

2. Chriſts ſecond coming (his coming to judgment) was revealed to ſome of the Patriarchs before the flood; and therefore it is (to ſpeak the leaſt) moſt highly probable, that his firſt coming (his coming in fleſh) was alſo revealed to them by God. See *Jude* 14, 15, wherein he affirms, *That* Enoch *the ſeventh from* Adam *propheſied ſaying*, *The Lord cometh with ten thouſands of his Saints*, *To execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly of all their ungodly deeds, which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard ſpeeches, which ungodly ſinners have ſpoken againſt him.* It is not material to enquire, how this propheſie came to the cognizance of the Apoſtle St. *Jude*. It may be ſufficient to ſay, that in all probability he did receive it from common and undoubted tradition tranſmitted from the Patri-

archs

archs (whom I am now speaking of) and so handed from generation to generation, till such time as it seemed good to the Holy Ghost by this Apostle to make it a part of canonical Scripture, even as certain other matters of ancient tradition are now made a part of Scripture by the Apostle St. *Paul*, such as that passage about *Jannes* and *Jambres*, 2 *Tim.* 3. 8. and that about *Moses* his saying, *I exceedingly fear and quake*, *Heb.* 12. 21. with several others, which might be named. We have heard of the prophecy of *Enoch*, and what any of Gods Prophets have spoken, God is said by them to have spoken (*Luke* 1. 70. *As he spake by the mouth of all his holy Prophets since the world began*, saith *Zachary* in his *Benedictus*,) and that it was the Lord Christ (though not as altogether excluding the Father and the Holy Ghost) of whose coming to judgement *Enoch* did prophesie, is that, which is beyond all question and not in the least doubted of by any Christian, he who is here styled The Lord, being elsewhere, where his coming to judgment is spoken of, called the Son of man, *Mat.* 16. 27. and the Great God and our Saviour, Jesus Christ, *Tit.* 2. 13.

I shall submit these things to consideration, omitting (for brevity sake) to speak concerning the Patriarchs offering sacrifices to God, their bloody sacrifices being (as is generally conceived, and as I still do think) typical Gospel instituted by God to typifie the bloodshed of the Messias.

To conclude this Chapter, from what hath been said concerning the object of the faith of the Patriarchs before the flood expressed in those words of the Author to the *Hebrews chap.* 11. 6. I shall commend this to observation, *viz.* That

the object of their faith was not onely bleſſedneſs promiſed, and expected, but alſo duty commanded, it being in thoſe words plainly implyed, that they did believe the diligent ſeeking of God to be a duty incumbent upon every ſinner in order to their being made bleſſed by God as Remunerator of all thoſe, who do faithfully ſerve him.

I ſhall now proceed to another Queſtion, wherein we all under the New Teſtament are more nearly concerned, and therefore have the greater need to be rightly and duly informed.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXVIII.

Q. *What is the object of that Christian faith, which in the New Testament is promised by God to be imputed to sinners for righteousness?* Answ. *Two remarkable differences in the object of their, and our Christian faith specified, the one styled Modal, the other Material, the object of our Christian faith being of larger extent, than that of the said Patriarchs. A refutation of those who do assert* ens incomplexum, i. e. *the person of Christ to be the adequate object of justifying faith as justifying, as also of those, who will not extend the object of justifying faith [as justifying] so far as to whole Christ in person,* i. e. *to Christ as considered in all his Offices, but do restrain it to the formal consideration of him onely as a Priest. Three causes of this mistake in a late learned Latine Author. The suffrage of that most judicious and impartial Author* Le-Banch *one of the very learned Professors of Divinity in* Sedan.

Q. *WHat is the object of that Christian faith, which in the New Testament is promised by God to be imputed to sinners for righteousness?*

Ans. The whole word of God is the adequate object

object of faith: and as the word of God, for so much as was in former ages made known to the Patriarchs before the flood & unto *Abraham* in his days, was the object of their faith, so is the same word of God together with such other revelations as God hath since those times made known unto us, the object of ours, 1 *Tim.* 1.15. But the more especial object of our Christian faith is the Gospel of Christ incarnate, this was the special object of that faith, which *John* the Baptist preached, saying, *Repent ye, and believe the Gospel, Mar.* 1.15. and which our Saviour gave in commission to his Apostles after his resurrection to be preached to all the world, saying, *Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every Creature, He that believeth, shall be saved* (*Mark* 16.15, 16.) *Believeth what? Answ.* Believeth that Gospel, which was in his name to be preached to every creature.

By this Gospel life and immortality is said to be brought into light, 2 *Tim.* 1. 10. that is, into much more, and clearer light than by that, which was preached to *Abraham* and the Patriarchs before the flood. This Gospel to be preached to all the world, reveals to us the accomplishment of the prophesies and promises of the old Testament concerning our Saviours incarnation, death, resurrection.--Hereby two remarkable differences appear to be betwixt our Christian faith and the faith of *Abraham* with the Patriarchs before the flood, *e.g.* 1. The object of their faith was the word of God unwritten; for it appears not, that any part of Gods word was in their days committed to writing, nor till the days of *Moses*, which was certain hundred years after *Abrahams* time, as appears by *Gen.* 15.13, 14.

But the object of our faith is the written word of God, it having since those days been committed to writing, styled The Scripture. Whence that saying of our Saviour to the Jews, *Joh.* 5,39. *Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think, ye have eternal life, and they are they, which testifie of me*: And that of St *John* the Evangelist, saying, *Joh.* 20. ult. *These things are written, that ye might believe, that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and that believing, ye might have life through his name.* This difference *ex parte objecti*, respectively to the object, is onely Modal, the next following is Material.

2. The object of their faith was of narrower extent, than that of ours. As the object of *Abrahams* faith was of larger extent, than that of the Patriarchs (for *Abraham* was to believe, that in his seed all nations should be blessed, which is more than to believe simply, or indefinitly, that it should be through the seed of a woman) so the object of our Christian faith is of larger compass, than was that of *Abrahams*: for besides the Scriptures of the Old Testament written by *Moses*, and the Prophets, the Scriptures of the New Testament are the objects of that faith, which is, or is to be imputed to believing Christians for righteousness, there being therein new Articles of faith added to the old, upon the belief whereof the salvation of sinners doth depend. It is not enough now to believe, that God is gracious and mercifull and will not turn his face from us, if we turn to him, but we must believe also, that Jesus Christ (the son of the blessed Virgin) is the true Messias, is He, by, and through whom we must turn to God, and for whose sake God in mercy will turn to us, according to that of

our

our Saviour, *If ye believe not, that I am he, ye ſhall die in your ſins, Joh.* 8. 24. It is not enough for a ſinner now to believe, that God is, and that he is a rewarder of them, that diligently ſeek him; but he muſt believe alſo, that the ſaid Jeſus is the Chriſt the Son of God, if he will have life through his name. *If thou ſhalt confeſs with thy mouth the Lord Jeſus* (ſays St. *Paul Rom.* 10. 9.) *and ſhalt believe in thine heart, that God raiſed him from the dead, thou ſhalt be ſaved.* And *Rom.* 4. 24. he concludes what he had at large in that Chapter ſpoken concerning *Abrahams* operative faith, ſaying, That as *Abrahams* obediential faith was imputed to him for righteouſneſs, ſo it was recorded for our ſakes, to whom the like obediential faith ſhall be imputed, if we believe the additional Articles of the Chriſtian faith, whereof he makes inſtance in a prime one, *viz.* The reſurrection of Chriſt, which Article as it ſuppoſeth his death, or delivery for our offences, ſo upon it the belief of other Articles of the Chriſtian faith doth depend; *If we believe* (ſays he *Rom.* 4. 24.) *on him, who raiſed up Jeſus our Lord from the dead.*

As for the object of ſaving faith, as alſo the acts, or actings of faith converſant thereabout (which will be ſpoken of in the next Chapter) I ſhall commend to obſervation the words of the late Aſſembly of Divines ſitting at *Weſtminſter* in the Confeſſion of their faith, they ſaying Chap. 14. *By this ſaving faith a Chriſtian believeth to be true whatſoever is revealed in the word for the authority of God himſelf ſpeaking therein, and acteth differently upon that, which each particular paſſage thereof containeth, yielding obedience to the commands, trembling at the threatnings, and embracing the pro-*

miſes of God for this life and for that, which is to come.

Be it obſerved, That thoſe Reverend Divines do make the whole word of God to be the object of ſaving faith, not onely promiſes, but commands and threatnings alſo, the threatnings of the word being a part of that Goſpel, which was commanded by Chriſt to be preached to every creature, as was proved in the foregoing Chapter from thoſe words of his to his Apoſtles, *Mark* 16. 15, 16. The premiſſes conſidered, it ſeems to me, that thoſe Authors are miſtaken, who do aſſert the perſon of Chriſt to be the adequate object of our Chriſtian faith, as it juſtifies. This is the aſſertion of that learned Author and great Schoolman Doctor *Ames* in his *Med. Theol. lib.* 1. *chap.* 27. *th.* 17. *Chriſtus eſt adequatum objectum fidei, quatenus fides juſtificat*, *Chriſt*, ſays he, *is the adequate object of faith as it juſtifies*; Which he therefore doth aſſert to be not *Ens complexum* [Not this, or that axiom, or propoſition] but *Ens incomplexum*, the perſon of Chriſt, or Chriſt in perſon. Whereas the truth to my ſeeming is this, *viz.* That as *Ens complexum* (God is, and is a Rewarder of them, who diligently ſeek him) was the object of the faith of the Patriarchs, as juſtifying, and as thoſe revelations, which God made to *Abraham* (conſiſting as aforeſaid in commands and promiſes) were the objects of his juſtifying faith, as juſtifying, ſo it is *Ens complexum*, the Goſpel of Chriſt, or the promiſe of ſalvation to ſinners upon their ſincere believing in Chriſt as crucified, dead, riſen again and aſcended, that is the object of juſtifying faith, as juſtifying. As this ſeems to be apparent by what hath been already ſaid in

this

this Chapter, ſo it may further appear by what will be ſaid in the next concerning thoſe actings of faith, that are made of God the condition of our being juſtified. In the mean time let it be obſerved, that thoſe are miſtaken, who would not have the object of juſtifying faith (as juſtifying) extended ſo far as to the perſon of Chriſt, *i.e.* to whole Chriſt as conſidered in all his Offices, but do reſtrain it to the formal conſideration of his perſon onely as a Prieſt. I remember this to have been the miſtake of Mr *Thomas Blake* of *Thamworth*, To whom Mr *Richard Baxter* did make a reply (I think truly ſatisfactory) and which I read many years ago. And I do perceive by my late reading, that that learned Author is followed with another pious, learned, and reverend *Thomas*, who although he declares himſelf to be ſo far ſatisfied with Mr *Baxters* definition of juſtifying faith (it being, as Mr *Baxter* well ſays, A receiving of Jeſus Chriſt in all his Offices, as Prophet, Prieſt and King) as not to deny, that it receives a whole Chriſt, nevertheleſs he will not yield, that Chriſt is the formal object of faith as juſtifying, being conſidered in all his Offices, but only as in his prieſtly function.

I will relate his mind in his own words, and I will then reply thereunto.

Chriſtus, ſays that Reverend and learned Author, *eſt objectum juſtificationis ut quod, ſive materiale; ut ſervator tantum formale, ſive ut Quo*, i.e. *etſi idem Chriſtus ſit Dominus, & ſacerdos, totuſque in juſtificatione recipiatur, Totus tamen omni ſenſu*, i. e. *omnium promiſcuè munerum intuitu ad juſtificationem formaliter non requiritur, ſed tantum qua ſacerdos, & legi ſatisfaciens*, i. e. *Chriſt is the*

material object of justification, the formal onely as Saviour, i. e. *although the same Christ be both Lord, and Priest, and whole Christ be received in justification, yet the intuition, or consideration of him as such respectively to all his Offices is not required formally to justification, but onely as a Priest and satisfying the law. The reason hereof* (says he page 113.) *is, because to be justified is nothing else, but to be freed from the curse of the law, and how are we so freed, but by the satisfaction of Christ? and how did Christ satisfie for us, but as that great Priest and Sacrifice, who died for us? as a Prophet he teaches, as he a King he commands, as a Priest onely he reconciles us to God.*

To these forecited words I reply, 1. It is strange to me, that such an acute Disputant and learned Schoolman as this Reverend Author, should affirm Jesus Christ to be in any sense the object of justification whether the material or formal: for it is with me an undoubted truth, that it is not Christ under any consideration, who is any kind of object of justification, but it is the sinner himself, who is the material object of justification, and it is the same sinner as Penitent, or believing in Christ, who is the formal object thereof. Christ indeed is most truly and fitly said to be the meritorious efficient cause, which doth procure a sinners justification, and his bloodshed as Priest, or sacrifice may be truly and aptly said to be the thing, whereby he did meritoriously procure the same: But it is neither fitly nor truly said of Christ under any consideration, that he

Memorandum, that these reflections upon this Reverend and learned Author were written before his death, and before Mr *Baxters* reply to him came forth in Print.

he is the object of justification, whether *ut Quod*, or *ut Quo*, material, or formal.

Object. The said Author by *Objectum justificationis* doth not mean the object of justification, but *Objectum fidei justificantis*, the object of justifying faith as it justifies?

Answ. 1. If this was his meaning, it was his oversight, and he did not well not to speak as he meant.

2. Whatever his meaning was, it is intolerably said, That Christ is the object of our justification, or of any ones justification, but his own, or that of his own person, himself being said in Scripture [in a peculiar sense] to be justified.

3. I am verily perswaded, that this Author according as is here pretended in the objection, by *objectum justificationis* did not mean the object of justification, but of justifying faith, and I doubt not, but that (the occasion of his words being duly considered) this ought to be his meaning, it being *Lapsus pennæ*, not *error mentis*. And because I conceive this to be his true meaning, I have therefore thought meet in the handling of the present Question, to take the said passage into consideration; and thereupon to his supposed true intent and meaning therein, I shall now reply, that it will not follow, that because Christ did merit our justification formally onely as a Priest, we are therefore *Intueri*, to behold, consider, or receive him onely as such in order to our actual justification; for it is evident, that

God in his Gospel, or law of grace doth to this end require of sinners not onely the intuition, but also the acceptation of Jesus Christ in all his offices, both as Lord and Saviour.

The main grounds of this Authors mistake in this matter seem to be such as these,

1. That he doth not mind to distinguish betwixt justification barely as merited and as actually confer'd: For though it be granted, that Christ hath merited our justification formally as a Priest, yet he doth not confer it precisely, or onely as such, but as Lord, and Legislator, and this also he doth upon such terms as in his law of grace (the instrument of conveyance) he hath constituted in order to the collation or enjoyment thereof.

2. In that he doth not duly consider, that it is not Christs satisfaction alone, that doth actually entitle sinners to pardon of sin, or justification: for if the expiation of sin (the thing indeed, which hath been done on Christs part) were the onely requisite to the actual pardoning thereof, it would follow from thence, that all and every sinner had a title to pardon, or that all sinners were *ipso facto* actually thereby pardoned, and that no sinner is thereby entitled to pardon of sin more than another, forasmuch as Christ by the sacrifice of himself was a ransome for all, even a propitiation for the sins of the whole world.

3. In that he doth not mind to distinguish betwixt two sorts of benefits, which sinners do enjoy

enjoy by Christ, some whereof are by, or from Christ as Absolutely considered, and some from him onely as received, or accepted of by faith, *e. g.* Some benefit sinners do enjoy by Christ as absolutely considered, *i. e.* as considered barely upon account of what himself hath done as a Priest in offering himself an expiatory sacrifice for sin, and the benefit, which all sinners do hereupon immediately enjoy is a general Act of Oblivion, or a conditional grant of pardon for all their sins. This benefit they do enjoy antecedently to their faith, yea whether ever they believe it, or no. But some benefit (*e. g.* actual pardon, justification, and reconciliation with God) sinners do not enjoy by Christ barely as so considered, but as received or accepted by faith (for these benefits a sinner doth not enjoy antecedently to, but consequently upon his sincere believing) accepted I mean in all his Offices, both as Lord and Saviour, as our Redeemer and our Ruler. Nothing seems to me more apparent by the Scriptures, than that a sinners actual pardon doth depend upon his acceptance of whole Christ *i. e.* in one Office as well as in another. See for this purpose, *Act.* 3. 23. where excision is threatned to every soul, that will not hear Christ as the great Prophet of his Church; and *Luke* 19. 27. where sinners are doom'd to destruction for rejecting Christ in his kingly function, or because they will not suffer him as their rightful Lord and Redeemer to rule over them.

Hitherunto I have expressed my dissent or dissatisfaction as to the forecited words of this Reverend Author; nevertheless there are two things in them, wherein I am better satisfied.

1. In

1. In that he doth plainly insinuate the justification of a sinner to be in effect the same thing with his reconciliation to God.

2. In that he doth expresly assert a sinners justification to be his freedom from the curse of the Law. And I do thereupon crave leave heartily to commend them, specially the last of these true sayings to the remembrance of himself and all my dissenting Brethren: for I do humbly conceive, that a due recognition thereof is enough to cause them to dissent from that Author in his *Justificatio Paulina*, the design of which is to prove, That God requires no other Evangelical grace, but onely faith in order to the justification of a sinner: for what is more manifest by the current of Scripture, than that Repentance towards God, as well as faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ is required of sinners, that they may be delivered from the wrath of God and from the curse of the law? They, who will acknowledge (as all ought to do) that it is a sinners duty to repent of his sins, that he may be delivered from the wrath of God and from the curse of the law, and do withall acknowledge, that to be justified is to be delivered from that curse, cannot without extream forgetfulness, and self contradiction deny, that it is the duty of sinners to repent of their sins, that they may be justified from them, and consequently, that it is not by faith alone in way of contradistinction from, or in opposition unto all other Evangelical graces, or duties that sinners are justified, but by faith taken in a large, or comprehensive sense as including them.

I think

I think it not amiss in the close of this Chapter to inform the Reader, that since the writing thereof the *Theological Theses* of that most impartial and judicious Author [*Ludovicus Le Blanc* Professor of Divinity in *Sedan*] came to my hands, wherein having read his Lecture concerning the nature and essence of justifying faith, I am confirmed in the truth of what I have said in this Chapter concerning the object of justifying faith, and for that cause I shall transcribe the following passage in his said Lecture (Chap. 91.) wherein having denied the promises of the Gospel to be the sole object of justifying faith as justifying, and having asserted (most truly) that faith justifies us, as it is the condition of the new covenant, he adds,

Fides autem illa ——— *But that faith, which the Gospel requires as the condition, under which it offers salvation to us, doth not onely respect the promises of the Gospel, but also the precepts and doctrines thereof, such as that concerning the resurrection of Jesus Christ our Lord, as is manifest by those words of St.* Paul, Rom. 10. 9. *And therefore that faith, which is the condition upon which God for Christs sake absolves us from our sins and accounts us as righteous (pro justis habet) is not onely that act of the mind and will, wherewith we embrace the promises of grace, but that whereby we assent to the mysteries of the Gospel as true. And therefore we approve not those, who seem to restrain the object of faith as justifying to the promise of grace, although this promise be the chief object.*

I shall conclude this Chapter by minding the Reader, that those Authors, who do confine the object of justifying faith as justifying to the promises of salvation by Christ, (however many of them seem not to intend, but rather to gainsay it)

must

must, whether they will or no, extend it to the precepts of the Gospel: for all the promises of justification, remission of sin, and salvation by Christ are conditional, *i. e.* they are made upon condition of our obedience to the precepts of Christ, styled obedience to the Gospel, this obedience being styled obedience sometimes to the Gospel of God, 1 *Pet.* 4.17. and sometimes to the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, 2 *Thes.* 1.8. and sometimes the obedience of faith, *Rom.* 16. 26.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXIX.

Q. Is it onely one act, or one kind of acts of faith, or else various acts thereof, and of divers kinds, respectively whereunto it is said, That Abrahams *faith was imputed to him for righteousnes?* Ans. *The most noted distinction of two kinds of the acts of faith, styled Elicite and Imperate, being premised, exemplified and explained, the Question it self is perspicuously answered; and this in way of dissent from those Brethren, who instruct sinners to believe, that they are to be justified onely by one act of faith, which act various Authors do use to express by various phrases, some whereof are indeed Scriptural expressions, and some of their own invention. Certain of these Authors are instanced in, and their words being recited, a reply is made thereunto, together with a passage in the larger Catechism of the late Assembly of Divines.*

FOrasmuch as it hath been made apparent, that faith not as figuratively taken, *i.e.* for the object of faith [Christs righteousnes,] but in proper construction for faith it self is imputed to sinners for righteousnes, and forasmuch as the whole

whole word of God, ſpecially the Goſpel of Chriſt ſtyled the word of faith, *Rom.* 10.9. hath been declared to be the object of faith, the next & laſt Queſtion ſhall be concerning the act, or acts of faith, that is, or are imputed to believers for righteouſneſs.

Q. *Is it onely one act of faith, or certain acts of faith onely of one kind, or elſe various acts of faith, and of various kinds, reſpectively whereunto it is ſaid, that* Abrahams *faith was imputed to him, and that ours ſhall be imputed to us for righteouſneſs?*

Anſw. This Queſtion doth ſuppoſe, or take it for granted (as the very truth is) that there are divers acts of faith, yea acts of a divers kind, and ſpecificated from the divers objects thereof. The moſt notable diſtinction of the acts of faith in the uſual terms of the School, is into Acts Elicite, & Imperate, *i.e.* Immediate, and Mediate, *i.e.* ſuch as are immediately exerted by the habit of faith in the ſoul, and from thence bubbling (as I may ſo ſay) as water from the fountain, or elſe ſuch as faith dictates to be done through the intervention of other graces, or actings of them.

An act of Faith of the former kind ſtyled Elicite, is an aſſenting to the truth of what God ſays, a believing, that ſuch, and ſuch things are promiſed, or commanded by God, are (to ſpeak in the language of Scripture, 1 *Pet.* 4. 11. and *Rom.* 3.2.) λόγια, the Oracles of God.

An act, or acting of Faith of the latter kind ſtyled Imperate, is by vertue of the former act to do the thing, or things by God commanded, ſo as that we may enjoy the good by him promiſed, *e.g.* An aſſenting to this truth, or truths, That God is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently ſeek him, is an Elicite act of Faith,

and

and our diligent ſeeking of God thereupon is an imperated act of Faith; or rather (to ſpeak the full truth, it is a complication of many imperated acts: for ſuch a conſtellation, or complication of duty doth the phraſe (ſeeking of God) import both in that Scripture, and in many other texts, it imports, I ſay, many acts of the ſoul, yea of the whole man. If the matter be not by this inſtance made ſufficiently obvious to common underſtanding, I will endeavour to make it more plain (if poſſible) ſo that the moſt illiterate perſon may perceive the meaning, and this I will attempt by the moſt familiar inſtance, that at preſent I can think upon, *e. g.* To aſſent to the truth of this revelation in Gods word (That he, who hideth his ſins, ſhall not proſper, but whoſoever confeſſeth and forſaketh them, ſhall have mercy) is an Elicite, or an immediate act of Faith, and ſo is our truſting to, or fiducial recumbency upon God, and his faithfulneſs, that ſo it ſhall be both with the one, and with the other; but by vertue of this, or theſe acts of Faith to diſcover, confeſs and forſake our ſins, are imperated, or mediate acts of Faith. Now the Queſtion is, Whether God doth impute to us the former onely, or thoſe and the later alſo for righteouſneſs? To which I do now make anſwer roundly, and plainly, that both the ſaid kinds of acts of Faith are imputed by God unto ſinners for righteouſneſs.

The truth of this anſwer is apparent by what hath been already ſaid two ways, 1. In declaring by the moſt familiar inſtances, what are the ſeveral acts of Faith (ſtyled Elicite and Imperate, Mediate and Immediate) for is it rational, or is it not rather moſt abſurd, and ſenſeleſs to imagine,

imagine, that God ſhould impute to us for righteouſneſs our bare crediting, or believing barely, that he is a rewarder of them that diligently ſeek him, or that ſuch ſhall have mercy, and not at all impute to us for righteouſneſs the things, or duties, which by vertue of that Faith we do, *i. e.* our actual ſeeking of God, our not hiding, but confeſſing, and forſaking our ſins? Yea, if compariſon were fit to be made, is it not more agreable to common reaſon and plain Scripture to imagine the imputation of the latter kind of the acts of Faith to us for righteouſneſs rather than the former? If one of them muſt be excluded, which in reaſon do we think ſhould, or ought to be exempted from the priviledg, or promiſe of the ſaid imputation? But we need not to anſwer, or propoſe any ſuch Queſtion, it being enough to ſay, That Scripture excludes neither, but includes both in the word [Faith] in all ſuch Texts, where it is ſaid to be by God imputed to us for, or to righteouſneſs.

2. The truth of the ſaid anſwer hath been already made evident in what hath been ſaid concerning the object of *Abrahams* Faith, that was imputed to him for righteouſneſs, and of our Chriſtian faith, which ſhall to the ſame purpoſe be imputed to us. The object of both, as hath been manifeſted, are not onely divine promiſes, but alſo divine commands, a practical Faith of which commands by vertue of Faith in the promiſes was that thing, which was imputed to *Abraham*, and which ſhall be imputed to us for righteouſneſs.

I deſire, that the anſwer to this Queſtion may be obſerved as matter of my profeſſed diſſent from thoſe miſtaken Brethren, who have in

their Sermons, or Writings divulged the contrary doctrine, teaching people to believe, that a ſinner is juſtifyed by one act, or one onely kind of acts of Faith, thoſe ſtyled Elicite, which by various Preachers and Authors, are in various words expreſſed, *viz. A leaning upon Chriſt, rolling our ſelves upon him, laying down our ſins at his croſs, or upon his ſhoulders, taking from him his righteouſneſs, an apprehending, or laying hold upon Chriſt, a recumbency of the ſoul upon him, an embracing of his righteouſneſs, an accepting his righteouſneſs alone and nothing elſe for our juſtification, a renouncing of all our own perſonal righteouſneſs in order to our juſtification in the ſight of God, a cleaving to his merits alone, and reſting upon nothing elſe for ſalvation, an hiding of our ſelves in his wounds, as Doves in the clefts of the rocks, an applying of Chriſt and his righteouſneſs to our ſelves*——Which laſt phraſe (the application of Chriſts righteouſneſs to our ſelves) being an expreſſion full of ambiguity (ſome Writers underſtanding one thing by it, and ſome another.) I am truly ſorry as well for that, as for other reaſons, that it ever came into the deſcription of juſtifying faith as juſtifying, it being a phraſe more fit (as I ever did and ſtill do think, ſubmiſſively be it ſaid) to amuſe, perplex and entangle poor Chriſtians, than to edifie them in the nature of ſaving faith, as ſaving.

Of this ambiguity ſee *Le Blanc* in his *Theological Theſes page* 207. *th.* 74, 75, 76, 77, 78.

As for the refutation of the ſaid miſtaken Brethren, beſides what hath been already ſaid, I deſire the Reader to conſider what is written by two Apoſtles, S. *Paul* and S *James*. 1. That of S. *Paul*, *Rom.* 4. 20, 21. wherein commend-

ing *Abrahams* faith, he ſays, *He ſtaggered not at the promiſe of God, being fully perſwaded, that what he had promiſed he was able to perform.* Was not this in *Abraham* a diſtinct act of faith from the accepting of Chriſts righteouſneſs to juſtifie him, or a recumbing upon it alone for that purpoſe? And yet doth the Apoſtle immediately ſay upon *Abrahams* thus acting faith (ver. 22.) And therefore it was imputed to him for righteouſneſs.

Again, it is conſiderable what he ſays in ver. 24. It was written for us, to whom it ſhall be imputed, if we believe on him, who raiſed up Jeſus our Lord from the dead. Is the belief of Chriſts reſurrection from the dead no diſtinct act of Faith from leaning upon Chriſt, accepting his righteouſneſs——And yet doth the Apoſtle affirm, that faith thus acted is imputed to us for righteouſneſs, or that thus cordially believing (which is to be underſtood *Cæteris paribus*, other neceſſaries correſponding, as I may not unfitly expreſs the Apoſtles meaning) we believe to righteouſneſs, *Rom.* 10.9,10

2. As it appears by the forecited words of St. *Paul*, ſo it ſeems no leſs demonſtrable from that of St. *James*, chap. 2. 21, 22, 23. where, 1. He aſſerts *Abraham* to have been juſtified by works, and he doth exemplifie the matter by one eminent work, or Imperated act of his faith, *viz.* the offering of his ſon *Iſaac* upon the altar.

2. He bids us take notice of it, ſaying, Seeſt thou? or thou ſeeſt, How faith wrought with his works and by works was Faith made perfect, *i. e.* made perfectly available to its appointed end, *i.e.* to juſtifie *Abraham*. As *Abrahams* Faith, ſo that Imperated act, or work of his Faith did cooperate (it wrought) towards the ſelf ſame iſſue.

3. He

3. He tells us, that thereupon the Scripture was fulfilled, which ſaith, *Abraham* believed God, and it was imputed to him for righteouſneſs. Now how can it be truly ſaid, that the ſaid Scripture was therupon fulfilled, if we confine the meaning of the word (faith, or believing God, or believing in the Lord) onely to one Elicite act of Faith, or to acts onely of that kind, and do not extend it to that Imperated act, or work of Faith in *Abrahams* offering his ſon upon the altar?

I do the rather deſire, that the premiſſes may be taken into impartial conſideration, becauſe they are ſubſervient to rectifie what we read to the contrary in ſeveral Authors, among whom I ſhall inſtance in ſome, and having recited their words, I will ſhape a reply thereunto.

In the firſt place I will recite a paſſage of Dr. *Ames* in his *Med. Theol. l.* 1. *c.* 27. *th.* 17. Wherein having juſtly rejected a bare general aſſent to the truth of Gods word as not juſtifying Faith (*th.* 16.) he adds, ſaying, (*th.* 17) *Fides illa proprie dicitur juſtificans, qua*——*That Faith is properly ſaid to be juſtifying, whereby we do reſt on Chriſt for the pardon of our ſins and ſalvation: for Chriſt is the adequate object of faith* (Quatenus) *as it juſtifies: faith alſo doth not juſtifie* (aliâ ratione) *for any other reaſon, or upon any other account, but as it apprehends that righteouſneſs, for which we are juſtified; and that righteouſneſs doth not conſiſt in the truth of any propoſition, to which we do aſſent, but onely in Chriſt, who was made ſin for us, that we might be made the righteouſneſs of God in him*, 2 *Cor.* 5. 21.

But the truth is, 1. Although Jeſus Chriſt be a chief object, yet he is not the ſole or adequate object of juſtifying Faith as it juſtifies, as hath been already manifeſted in the foregoing Chap-

ter. Christ indeed is but the mediate, not the ultimate, and therefore not the adequate object of our faith as justifying; for as it is God, who justifies, so it is through Christ, that sinners are to believe in God, according to that description, which St. *Peter* gives of those believers, to whom he directs his Epistle, saying, *Christ was manifest in these last times for you, who by him do believe in God, that raised him up from the dead, and gave him glory, that our faith and hope might be in God*, 1 *Pet* 1.20,25.

2. Although a sinner by faith doth apprehend the righteousness of Christ, *i. e.* doth believe Christs righteousness to be the meritorious cause of pardon of sin, and doth rest, or lean upon it as such, nevertheless that Faith doth not justifie him *Illâ ratione*, as it is such a leaning, or apprehension: for it is not this or that act of faith that justifies us, but all of both kinds as well Elicite as Imperate that are in the covenant of grace promised by God to be imputed to us for righteousness, or as they are therein constituted by God the condition of our justification, and accordingly performed.

2. God in his Gospel of Grace hath not constituted the said apprehension of Christs righteousness, or leaning upon it, or him for pardon the sole condition of a sinners justification, or of their being made the righteousness of God in him, but it is such a belief of Gods word, specially of the conditional promises of salvation through Christ, as doth effectually induce sinners to perform the conditions thereof, *i. e.* to repent and convert from their sins, and in so doing absolutely to rest, or lean upon Christ for pardon and salvation.

3. Upon

3. Upon the ſame reaſon as this learned Author doth reject a bare general aſſent to the truth of Gods word from being that faith, whereby we are juſtified; he ought to have rejected the apprehenſion of Chriſts righteouſneſs, and a ſinners recumbency thereon from being that faith, whereby they are juſtified: for as that general aſſent, ſo this apprehenſion of Chriſts righteouſneſs, or recumbency upon Chriſt may be in men continuing wicked, as is moſt manifeſt by the Scriptures, and by ſad experience. Thoſe, whoſe neck was as an iron ſinew, and their brow as braſs, did notwithſtanding ſtay themſelves upon the God of *Iſrael*, and lean upon the Lord, ſaying, None evil can come upon us, as the Prophets *Iſaiah* (ch. 48. 2. 4.) and *Micah* (ch. 3. 11.) have teſtified; and the like is witneſſed by our Saviour concerning thoſe, who perſiſting to be workers of iniquity, will nevertheleſs lean upon him for ſalvation, *Mat.* 7. 12, 13. Hence it appears,

1. That it is not true to ſay, that a bare apprehenſion of Chriſts righteouſneſs, or a leaning upon Chriſt will juſtifie ſinners, or is juſtifying Faith, or is that faith, which in the Goſpel of Chriſt is made the condition of their juſtification.

2. That it is much leſs true to ſay with that forenamed Author, that faith doth *illâ ratione*, therefore juſtifie ſinners, as it doth ſo apprehend, and lean upon Chriſt and his righteouſneſs.

I have the rather thought meet to reply to that paſſage in this Author, becauſe I gueſs, that by his means (he being a perſon ſo famed for piety and School-divinity) divers have been led

into the ſame, or the like miſtakes, among whom I ſhall inſtance in two particular perſons, by name Dr. *Grew* and Mr. *Thomas Shepheard* of New *England*. As for Dr. *Grew*, in his Sermons upon *Jeremy*, ch. 23. 6. (*p.* 147, 148.) he aſſerts, *That the act of faith, which juſtifies us, is an act of recumbence and reliance upon Chriſt as he is made ſin for us and righteouſneſs to us, and thus offered in Scripture to our faith*—— *This and this only act of faith juſtifies us* —— and 149. *Thus we ſee* (ſays he) *the Goſpel hath brought the juſtifying act of faith into a little room and within compaſs.* And p. 152, 153. *All* (ſays he) *even the beſt of all in man, or which is done by a man, is hereby excluded from his juſtification, yea every act of faith beſides this of recumbence on Chriſt for righteouſneſs is excluded*——

I need not ſay much more for the refutation of theſe moſt dangerous miſtakes, than hath been already ſaid. I ſhall onely add, That the Doctor doth palpably and ſhamefully pervert the Goſpel of Chriſt in aſſerting, that it hath brought the juſtifying act of Faith into a little room: for it is he himſelf, who by the hammering of his own brain, or working fancy, not the Goſpel of Chriſt, that hath ſo reduced it; for the Goſpel of Chriſt makes juſtifying Faith to be of the ſame latitude, as obeying Chriſt, or obedience to his Goſpel, theſe phraſes being in the Goſpel of promiſcuous uſe, as any one, who will make uſe of his eyes, may ſee, and wherein alſo is plainly to be ſeen, that Jeſus Chriſt is offered to our Faith, not onely as he was made ſin for us, or as our great High-prieſt, who by his once offering of himſelf hath expiated our ſins, but alſo as our Teacher, Maſter, Leader and Ruler, and that our acceptation of him as thus both offered

offered for us and to us is the condition of our being actually juſtified.

Yet this Anti evangelical Author proceeds to ſay further, p. 182. *Its a dangerous thing to ſet up our own righteouſneſs, and graces and duties and works as a qualification for our faith in Chriſt; this is but clarified pryſon. As God hangs the earth upon nothing*, Job 26. 7. *So muſt we the righteouſneſs of Chriſt upon our own nothingneſs* ——

Such ſayings as theſe by this Doctor, with many other the like, I do judge to be a great ſcandal to the Proteſtant Churches, and to Chriſtian Religion, they being more groſs and ſhamefull, than (to my preſent remembrance) I have read in any Author, except in thoſe, who are moſt notorious for Antinomian Doctrine, ſuch as *Saltmarſh*, *Paul Hobſon* with their Peers. But bleſſed be God, that (ſo far as I know) I am able to ſay, that all the Proteſtant Churches do (even as the Goſpel of Chriſt it ſelf doth) make operativeneſs to be a Qualification for ſaving faith in Chriſt; whence it is, that they do uſually ſtyle juſtifying faith a lively faith, an effectual Faith (this being the language of Scripture) an obedientiall, or working faith (in oppoſition to that Faith, which St. *James* ſtyles a dead Faith) without which qualification they do profeſſedly teach, that the righteouſneſs of Chriſt will not juſtifie us, nor any Faith in his righteouſneſs. Nor ought ſinners to hang their hopes of Chriſts righteouſneſs, *i. e.* of their partaking in the ſaving benefits of Chriſts righteouſneſs upon any Faith, but a Faith ſo qualified, *i. e.* a penitential, obediential, lively, effectual, working Faith; & he, that hangs his hope upon any other, doth indeed hang it upon nothing, that will profit him

in the day of wrath. So that to instruct sinners to hang the righteousness of Christ (he means, I presume, their hopes of righteousness by Christ) upon their own nothingness, is indeed to tender to them a sweet and gilded poyson, which yet because of its sweetness to the taste, and speciousness to the eye is not a jot the less, but much the more dangerous, I mean, in its being apt to be swallowed, and in its being absolutely mortal by being digested.

The next Author I shall name is Mr. *Thomas Shepheard* (a man of great name in New *England*) who in his *Sincere Convert*, *page* 151. says, That by the first act of Faith a man glorifies God by obeying all the law at an instant in Christ: that is, as he apparently means, upon this first act of Faith a man so intitles himself to Christs perfect obedience, as that by vertue of that, he obeys all the law at an instant; but this is notoriously false to say, That Believers do by any act of their Faith (first, second, or third, yea from first to last) obey all the law, or any part of the law in, or by Christ, in the sense here intended by this Author with many other Brethren, as hath been already demonstrated in the first part of this Discourse concerning imputed Righteousness, to which I shall now add, That although Jesus Christ did obey all that law, which God gave him in the person of a Mediator to do, nevertheless it is false to say, That believers do obey that law, or any part of that law in Christ (whether in an instant, or in tract of time:) for although Christ did many things, which we sinners are bound to do by the law of God, yet he did them not by vertue of that obligation, that bound us to do them, but

by

by force of an obligation peculiar to himself, *i.e.* of his fathers command, and of his own voluntary consent, or undertaking: So that the law which he obeyed, or fulfilled, was peculiar altogether to himself, as to the formal obligation, although there were some things as to the matter of it, which we by Gods law imposed upon us are bound to do; I say some things: for as we are not bound by the law imposed upon us to do all, that Christ did, so neither was he bound by the law imposed upon him to do all, that we are bound to do; although the expression here of this Author doth imply, that he was; this also being it, which is frequently asserted by Dr. *Owen*, and by several other Brethren, the falshood whereof is of easie discovery, for if Christ did obey, or was obliged to obey all the law, which we are bound to obey, then was he obliged to repent and convert from sin, and to believe in himself for remission of sin: Whereupon *Saltmarsh* and other his Complices will be found to have been true witnesses of Christ in their dogmatizings concerning him, That he repented for us, converted for us and believed for us, these being duties imposed upon us by the law of God, and which we are to obey. There are many other erroneous and dangerous passages in this Authors book styled (*The Sincere Convert*) very fit to be brought to the touchstone with animadversions thereupon; but I shall forbear to lengthen this Discourse by mentioning them at this time.

Onely forasmuch as I have since the writing of the premisses received the *Theological Theses* of that most impartial and judicious Author *Le-Blanc* (the learned Professor of Divinity in *Sedan*)

dan) I will, to close this Chapter, transcribe out of that book several passages for the confirmation of what I have said in way of resolution of both the Questions which are the subject of this and the foregoing Chapter.

In his Lecture, *Quomodo fides justificat*, his words are (*p.* 255, 256.) *Imo, cum cum solam fidem justificare dicimus*——— *Yea, when we say, that faith alone doth justifie, we do not signifie, that the sole act of faith precisely taken, as it is opposed to the acts of love and hope, and is distinguished from amendment, or repentance is the condition, which the new Covenant or Gospel requireth, that we may obtain the forgiveness of our sins, and for Christs sake be absolved from them. For hope of pardon and the love of God, and also sorrow for sin and a purpose of a new life, and in one word, all the acts requisite to true and serious conversion, are also a certain thing necessary and altogether pre-required, that a man may be received into the favour of God, and may from thenceforth be by him had for a justified person, Yea, that lively faith, and working by love, which we do affirm alone to justifie, doth include and involve all those things. And as the Scripture doth frequently assert, that we have remission of sin through faith: so no less frequently and expresly doth it teach, that repentance and the whole conversion of a sinner to God, is the condition, without which pardon of sin cannot be obtained from God, and which*

Christian Reader, Observe well the words here of this Author, whereby you may perceive the true meaning, as of other Protestant Churches, so also of the Church of *England*, in that clause of the 11th Article, concerning the Justification of man, expressed in these words (That we are justified by faith onely, is most wholsome doctrine, and very full of comfort.) And thus is this Article expounded in the Homilies of our Church.

which is pre-required thereunto no leſs than faith, although it doth not effect, nor merit it, Prov. 28. 13. Act. 2. 38. and 3. 14. *But when the Scripture ſays, that a man is juſtified by faith and not by works, or without works, which we call being juſtified by faith alone, the meaning is ſimply this, That no man can be juſtified by performing the works, which the law requireth, that by it he may be juſtified, but onely by believing in Chriſt with a lively and effectual faith, which thing the Goſpel requires, that we may with God be accounted as righteous. And by works, which the law properly taken and as it is oppoſed to grace, or the Goſpel, doth exact to the juſtification of a man, is underſtood that perfect and by no ſin interrupted obedience, which doth exclude every tranſgreſſion and every ſin——*

And (*Th.* 35. he ſays) *As often as the Apoſtle affirms, that we are not juſtified by works, but by faith, he intends to teach* † *no other thing, than that none can be juſtified by ſuch an obſervation of the law, which the legal covenant requires, that we may have life through it and may eſcape the curſe of God; but that God doth account them as righteous, and doth of his meer grace beſtow the pardon of all their ſins upon all thoſe, who receive the Goſpel with a ſincere heart, and do from faith perform true obedience thereunto.*

† The Apoſtle doth intend to teach one other thing more, than is here mentioned by this Author, *viz.* That no man is juſtified by the works of the Moſaical law.

And according to this ſenſe of the word (works) doth he reconcile the two Apoſtles, St. *Paul* and St. *James* (ſeemingly oppoſite) ſaying *Th.* 39. *St.* Paul *will deny, that a man is juſtified by doing the works, which the law, as it is oppoſed to the covenant of grace, doth exact to the juſtification of*

of a perſon, which thing St. James *doth in no ſort affirm; but St.* James *intends to aſſert, that a man is juſtified not by that bare and naked aſſent, which is given to the word of the Goſpel, but by ſuch a faith as works by love, and which many good works do accompany, which thing St.* Paul *himſelf hath expreſly taught, ſo far he is from denying it. And therefore, when St.* James *ſays, Ye ſee, that a man is Juſtified by works and not by faith onely, it is the ſame as if he ſhould ſay, Ye ſee, that God doth not account him as righteous, who doth ſimply and nakedly give credit and aſſent to the word of God, but he, who with his faith doth joyn good works, and who hath faith efficacious in good works.*

I might for this purpoſe cite much more, were it needful, out of that learned and very judicious Proteſtant Writer; but I ſhall alledge his teſtimony for the countenance and confirmation of what I have aſſerted concerning faith its being imputed to us for righteouſneſs, and under what formal conſideration it is ſo imputed, for which purpoſe I ſhall tranſcribe and tranſlate his words *Theſ.* 22, 23.

It ſeems to us (ſimpliciſſimum) moſt ſimple, or plain, if we ſay, that Faith doth juſtifie, becauſe to a man believing, his faith is imputed to righteouſneſs: for ſo the Apoſtle explicates his own meaning, profeſſedly treating concerning Juſtification by faith, Rom. 4. 5. *To him, who believeth on him, that Juſtifieth the ungodly, his faith is accounted for righteouſneſs; and to this end he cites that of* Moſes (Abraham *believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteouſneſs.) Faith alſo is ſaid to be be imputed to us for righteouſneſs, becauſe God doth, hath and reputes him as righteous, freeing him from the puniſhment of his ſin, and accepting him to life eternal for the ſake of Chriſts death*

death and obedience, who doth with a lively faith believe in Christ: To the same sense or purpose (eodem redit) is the judgment of those, who teach, that Faith justifies us, as it is the condition of the covenant of grace: for in that their meaning is no other, but that God, that he may account us as, or for righteous (pro justis) and may accept us to eternal glory, doth in the Gospel require no other thing of us, but that we adhere to Christ by a lively faith and working by love; and that salvation and remission of sin is offered and promised to us in the word of the Gospel, upon, or under this condition, and no other; and that this is the reason, why in the Scripture we are said to be justified by faith.

Now forasmuch as the doctrine held forth in this Treatise concerning imputed righteousness, is so attested by such a most judicious Writer of the Protestant *French* Church; and forasmuch also as in these latter years it hath been much contended for by that indefatigable Writer, Mr *R. Baxter*, Dr *Henry More*, Mr *Edward Fowler*, Mr *Joseph Truman*, with other learned men of our own Church as Protestant, I shall leave it to consideration, how causeless the clamors of those are, who in the bitterness of their zeal do cry out against it, as a contradiction to the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, even in the highest point of Divinity, and as a piece of Popery, even the worst of Popery. It is upon this account, that a late Author is accused by one of those zealous Brethren, saying, *You have given away the better half of the Protestant Religion by contending for Justification by our own works. I had as lieve yield to all things else, which the Papist say, or do, as to this one damnable Doctrine, which is the very rats-bane of Popery*, viz. *That it is not (as Protestant*

ſtant Divines aſſert it to be) by the righteouſneſs of Jeſus Chriſt imputed to us, and applyed by faith, but by our own works in conformity to the moral law; (and again ſays he) They, who ſay, that men are not juſtified by the righteouſneſs of Chriſt imputed to them upon their believing, but their own works, or ſincere (though imperfect) obedience to the Goſpel, do ſay that the Church of England *erreth in the great Doctrine of Juſtification.*

Deus bone! Such accuſations, or declamations as theſe, I look upon as juſt matter of great ſadneſs, conſidering how the Proteſtant Churches generally, and the Church of *England* in ſpecial is thereby wronged, as if the one half of our Proteſtant Religion (as diſtinguiſhed from Popery) did conſiſt in what this Author would make us believe, whereas the foreſaid learned Proteſtant Author *Le-Blanc* in his Lecture (*Quomodo fides juſtificat*) among thoſe nine things, wherein he aſſerts the agreement of Proteſtants and Papiſts, doth name this as the third head of their accord, (p. 260.) *viz.*

Non ſolum credendi actum praciſe ſumptum —— That it is not the act of faith preciſely taken, but that many other acts alſo which do concur to true repentance and ſerious converſion to God, are conditions by God pre-required, that a man may obtain of God the pardon of his ſins, which is indeed (and as this Author alſo doth oft times aſſert) the ſelf thing in effect with Juſtification. So that whatſoever the opinion of this fervent Author, or of other ſingle leſs knowing Proteſtants is, the doctrine contended for by him is ſo far from being the one half, as that it is not to be accounted any part, or ſcruple of the true Proteſtant Religion: For the true Proteſtant Doctrine is not, That believers are juſtified

ſtified by Chriſts righteouſneſs in it ſelf imputed & in that ſenſe (the ſenſe of this Author) applyed to themſelves, or by themſelves, but that they are juſtified for the merits ſake of Chriſts righteouſneſs, which righteouſneſs of his is in the ſaving fruit or effects thereof (juſtification, or remiſſion of ſin thereby purchaſed) imputed, imparted, communicated, or (as modern Authors uſe to ſpeak) applyed to believers (not by themſelves, but) by God as Donour thereof; and this according to the tenour of his gracious promiſe upon their ſincere faith, this being the condition of the grant; in which promiſe, or conditional grant, the word Faith is not to be taken ſtrictly in oppoſition to repentance and all other Evangelical graces, or duties, but as including them. And yet the late Aſſembly of Divines in their larger Catechize in anſwer to that queſtion, How doth Faith Juſtifie a ſinner, return this poſitive anſwer.

Faith juſtifies a ſinner in the ſight of God, not becauſe of thoſe other graces, which do always accompany it, or of good works that are the fruits of it, nor as if the grace of faith, or any act thereof, were imputed to him for his juſtification, but onely as it is an inſtrument, by which he receiveth, and applyeth Chriſt, and his righteouſneſs.

But to demonſtrate the falſneſs of this Anſwer, I will more particularly conſider, 1. What Juſtifying Faith is. 2. How it Juſtifies.

Firſt, What is Juſtifying faith? To which Queſtion I will make anſwer, firſt in my own words, and then in theirs:

1. I will expreſs my ſenſe briefly in my own words, ſaying, Juſtifying faith is a practical aſſent to the truth of Gods word. If any ſhall deſire

ſire a larger Deſcription, I will ſay, Juſtifying Faith is a Practical aſſent to the truth of Gods word, but more eſpecially (I do not ſay properly) to that part of Gods word, which in a ſignal ſenſe, or for a peculiar reaſon, is ſtyled the word of Faith, *Rom.* 10. 8. that is, to the Goſpel of Chriſt, or promiſe of ſalvation through him unto the world of ſinners conditionally upon their return to him by repentance and faith, or as S. *Pauls* expreſſions are, *Act* 20. 23. Upon condition of their repentance towards God, and Faith towards our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, or as *Peter* expreſſeth the condition, *Act.* 3. 19. Repentance and Converſion, or as our Saviour in one word expreſſeth it, *Luke* 24. 47. Repentance. He that believes this word of God, with a practical faith, is juſtified, for this is juſtifying Faith.

2. I ſhall anſwer to the ſaid Queſtion in their own words, yet not in thoſe of their Catechiſm, but of their confeſſion touching ſaving Faith, Chap. 14. and ſay, *Juſtifying, or ſaving faith is that, by which a Chriſtian believeth to be true, whatſoever is revealed in the word for the authority of God ſpeaking therein, and acteth differently upon that, which each particular paſſage thereof containeth, yielding obedience to the commands, trembling at the threatnings, and imbracing the promiſes of God for this life, and that which is to come. But the principal acts of ſaving faith are accepting, receiving and reſting upon Chriſt alone for juſtificrtion, ſanctification and eternal life, by vertue of the covenant of grace.*

This to my ſeeming is a true and memorable deſcription of juſtifying Faith, and doubtleſs he, that doth ſo believe Gods word as to act ſutably to the different paſſes thereof (divine commands, threatnings and promiſes) ſhall be juſtified;

fied; and this I do affirm, Although such a believer never heard, or understood that (for ought I remember) unscriptural or apocryphal expression of applying Christ and his righteousness to himself. It is time now to make answer to the other Question.

Q. How doth Faith justifie a sinner in the sight of God? *Answ.* I need not at this time of day make answer to this Question, because it hath been so plainly and fully already answered in this Discourse, as well in my own as in the words of *Le-Blanc*: But if it must be answered again, I will still say as before, *viz.* That faith doth justifie a sinner in the sight of God, not for any merit, that is in it, or in any grace accompanying, or good works proceeding from it, but onely for the righteousness sake of Christ, and for Christs righteousness sake it becomes available to our justification in the sight of God, as the imputation of it to, or for righteousness is entailed upon it by the free promise of God in Christ, which is all one as to say, Faith justifies us in the sight of God as it is *Conditio novi fœderis præstita, i.e.* as it is the performance of the condition of life promised in the new covenant.

CHAP. XXX.

A brief reply to a passage in Doctor Owen, he saying, That in the doctrine by him asserted touching the Imputation of Christs righteousness he hath as good company as the Prelacy and the whole Church of England *can afford.*

HAving concluded the former long Chapter, I shall be very much briefer in this, my intent therein being to take into consideration a passage (of less moment indeed) in Doctor *Owens* Book, styled his Vindication against Mr. *Sherlocke*, forasmuch as it doth refer to the subject of this Discourse, wherein he doth excuse himself by the company, with whom he errs, if it be an errour to maintain the Imputation of Christs righteousness in the sense oppugned in this Treatise, he saying, p. 117. *Herein I have as good company as the Prelacy and whole Church of* England *can afford, sundry from among them having written large Discourses in its confirmation, and the rest having till of late approved of it in others.*

The Doctor doth here make mention of company both Good, and Great, wherein although I allow him to have spoken truth as to the quality of them, Yet as to their quantity, I cannot; to both which distinctly I will speak a few words. Allowing the truth of the former, I do further say, 1. It is matter of good hearing, that the Prelates are in reputation with the Doctor as

good

good company, this being more than many now adays will acknowledge, it being their manner to declaim againſt that whole Tribe, ſaying, There is none of them good, no not one, Yea to ſay of Prelacy it ſelf, as was prejudicately ſaid of *Galilee*, Can any good come out of Prelacy? But forasmuch as ſuch things are ſpoken not in corners, but upon the houſe top, and cannot therefore be hid from the Prelates, it is therefore in reaſon to be preſumed, that they will be the more circumſpect ſo to act in their ſeveral capacities (both as Chriſtians, Presbyters and Prelates) as to put to ſilence the ignorance of clamorous and fooliſh zeal.

2. As the Prelates are never the better company with ſome becauſe of their Prelacy, ſo neither is their, or the Doctors company to boot, ever the better with me, becauſe of their concurrence in a popular miſtake, it being my reſolution to keep company with the truth, although it happen, that I find it like a Sparrow upon the houſe top, ſitting alone, or like a Pellicane in the Wilderneſs, mourning for want of friends and followers.

3. If the Doctor here ſay true concerning the Prelates, I am truly ſorry in the Doctors behalf, but in my own I do rejoyce: I am indeed ſorry for the Doctor, in that differing from the Prelates in many things, wherein to my ſeeming they have the truth on their ſide, and being no companion with them in their Prelacy (as I heartily wiſh he were) he ſhould be ſo unfortunate as to light into their company in a certain path, wherein like men (for *Humanum eſt errare*) they have gone aſtray, having reaſon to make the like acknowledgment with the Church of old, ſaying,

ing, *Erravimus cum patribus*. But I am glad in my own behalf, forasmuch as I do now perceive, that the Doctor himself cannot but advocate for me, if he happen to hear me accounted as a Time-server, or as one, who wrote this Discourse out of design to please the Prelates, to curry favour with them, or to get Preferment from them: for to detect errours, in the guilt whereof the Prelates are involved, is not (one would think) the way to gain their friendship, or favour. Of a truth I now perceive, that the Doctor is convinced in conscience, that it was not the design of the Author of this Discourse to make him odious more than his good company the Prelates, and much less to make odious the whole party of dissenting Brethren.

4. I do firmly believe, that the Prelates may be good company, notwithstanding their association in errour, as aforesaid: for it is very possible, and I am verily hopeful, that it is a thing ordinary with not a few to hold false doctrines speculatively, but not practically; and I do cordially bear witness with Mr *Joseph Truman* (in his excellent Book styled *The Great Propitiation*, p. 137.) *That many of the worthiest men, both Prelates and others, that ever* England *had, held such things (the imputation of Christs righteousness, and certain errors depending thereupon) notionally, yet so as to deny the consequence, but never any good man* (says that learned and pious Author) *did hold them practically.*

2. I cannot allow the Doctors words as to the numerosity of his companions in those words of his (*The whole Church of* England,) in which saying he hath out-gone the truth: for (presuming that by the Church of *England* he meaneth

eth it as Proteſtant) I cannot but ſay, That as ſome Worthies of the Church of *Eng.* wrote for it, ſo others of our own (not to mention any of Forein Churches) wrote againſt it: As I could eaſily ſhew, had it not been largely done already by other hands, particularly by Mr *Bull* in his late learned Anſwer to his Adverſaries, and this Mr *Joſeph Truman* takes notice of in his *Great Propitiation* (p. 95.) Wherein after with ſeveral reaſons he had refuted the Imputation of Chriſts righteouſneſs in the ſenſe maintained by the Doctor, and in this Diſcourſe oppugned, he cloſeth his Arguments with this ſaying, *I am almoſt aſhamed to lay open the weakneſs of them, that hold theſe things, after ſuch multitudes of learned Proteſtants have ſhewn their abſurdity.*

But if the good company, with whom the Doctor doth erre in this matter, be juſt ground of eaſe to his mind, I ſhall grant it as a thing, that cannot be denied, and (as the ſaid Mr *Truman* ſays) is much to be lamented, that many important Doctrines of the Proteſtant Churches are frequently by too many groſly explained, and that by more than thoſe (ſays Mr *Baxter*) who are down right Antinomians, ſo as to have wofully ill conſequences attending them, to the ſcandal of the Proteſtant Religion, the heartning and hardning of our common adverſaries (both Papiſts and Socinians) againſt us, and to the prejudice of the power and practice of Chriſtianity: I mean more eſpecially ſuch Doctrines as do concern faith, and works, juſtification, and Imputed Righteouſneſs, for a redreſs whereof, were I able to do any thing more than hath been abundantly already done by others my betters, I could ſay with the Apoſtle, I would gladly ſpend, and

and be spent; spend I mean, not onely of my time, but my reputation also (as the Apostles meaning there is.) Though the more abundantly I loved, the less I should hap to be beloved of my dissenting brethren, for whose satisfaction I shall now in the closing of this Chapter commend to their consideration the saying of that learned and most judicious Author B. *Downam De grat. hab. ch.* 27. *De facto imputantur (extrinseca) quando illorum intuitu, & respectus habetur nobis ad aliquem effectum aque ac si à nobis vel in nobis essent*, Then those things, *which are without us*, i. e. *which are not ours in the propriety of the very things, or being properly taken do not belong unto us, are said to be imputed to us, when with respect to them we are equally intitled to their effects, or dealt with upon account of them, as if they had been done by us, or were inherent in us.* According to this sense of the word (Imputed) is the true and truly Protestant Doctrine concerning the imputation of Christs righteousness so to be expounded, as I have (I hope) made apparent more at large according to my design in this Discourse.

FINIS.